



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 2044 032 305 369

The Judæans



US
904
JUD



**HARVARD LAW SCHOOL
LIBRARY**

Compliments of the Publishers

Judæan Addresses

SELECTED

4

VOL. II



1900 - 1917

PUBLISHED BY

"THE JUDÆANS"

IN COMMEMORATION OF THEIR TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

NEW YORK
BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY

"The Jewish Book Concern"

1917

113
104
2112

T7
J92

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DR. HENRY M. LEIPZIGER: President's Address at Tenth Anniversary Meeting—"The Aims and Ideals of The Judæans".....	7
JOSEPH JACOBS: "Function of Jewish Scholarship".....	13
DR. K. KOHLER: "The Mission of the Jewish Encyclopedia".....	20
DR. EMIL G. HIRSCH: "Dr. Schechter and Jewish Scholarship in America"	23
DR. SOLOMON SCHECHTER: "Rebellion Against Being a Problem"....	27
ANATOLE LEROY-BRAULIERU: "Jewish Immigrants and Judaism in the United States"	33
LOUIS MARSHALL: "The Jews as Elements in the Population, Past and Present"	52
PROF. MORRIS LOEB: "The Jew as a Citizen".....	58
GEORGE S. HELLMAN: "The Congress of Berlin and the Jew".....	62
LEO MIELZINER: "Louis Loeb—A Tribute".....	74
DR. SAMUEL SCHULMAN: "The Jews and Economic Life." A Review of Sombart's "Jews and Capitalism".....	77
MAX J. KOHLER: "The Jew in his Relation to the Law of the Land"	91
ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: Address at a Meeting in his Honor.....	101
DR. MAURICE H. HARRIS: "Ruppin's 'Jews of To-Day'".....	103
BERNARD NAUMBURG: "Schnitzler's 'Prof. Bernhard'".....	119
DR. DAVID DE SOLA POOL: "The Jew as a Citizen in England".....	127
SOL. M. STROOCK: "The Jew as a Citizen in France".....	131
LEON HÜHNER: "The Jew as a Citizen in Germany".....	137
ARTHUR K. KUHN: "The Jew as a Citizen in Holland, Italy and Switzerland"	148
LEON S. MOISSEIFF: "Yiddish Literature in the United States—Its Relation to the Masses".....	153
DR. HENRY MOSKOWITZ: "A Quarter Century of the Jewish Immigrant in America"	160
PROF. JACOB H. HOLLANDER: "The Novel Jew".....	170
LIST OF MEETINGS AND PAPERS READ.....	179
CONSTITUTION	185
LIST OF OFFICERS.....	188
LIST OF MEMBERS.....	189

11/2/46 - 11.0. HV 250 21

620734

PREFACE

THE JUDEANS issued a volume in 1899 of selections of papers read before the society. The twentieth anniversary of the society's existence, which is about to occur, affords a convenient occasion for publication of another volume, made up of selections of addresses or papers since delivered before it. The selection has been quite arbitrary, and many addresses which would otherwise have been included have been omitted, either because they have not been preserved or because they are elsewhere conveniently accessible. Some papers have also been omitted through the application of the rule that no single contributor should appear more than once, others because they were of particular temporary or local interest, and still more for lack of space. A list of all the meetings held during this period, 1900-1917, together with titles of the papers presented and references to places of publication of the full papers or summaries, has been added at the close of the volume, as also the Constitution of the society and list of officers and members.

THE AIMS AND IDEALS OF THE JUDÆANS *

BY DR. HENRY M. LEIPZIGER, President of the Society

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you on behalf of The Judæans to the first meeting of the year, and practically the tenth anniversary of the founding of this little group. On the 27th of January, 1897, a group of five or six met and talked over the advisability of establishing a little society composed of men whose interests were not entirely material, not entirely commercial, and establishing a union which would lead to delightful intercourse, which might prove a sort of clearing-house of ideas and might prove of value to that portion of the community—not that we represent, because we represent nothing, do not claim to represent anybody—but to aid in the spiritual and intellectual development of the race to which we are proud to belong, and through our development, develop our own higher Americanism. We have existed for ten years. We have had delightful evenings. We have welcomed representative men, in the real sense. We have discussed topics that have been of broad and vital interest. We have had Zangwill and Leroy Beaulieu. We have welcomed to their respective high offices the President of the Hebrew Union College and the President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. We have had a gathering at which we have had the leaders of that noble and useful institution, the Union Theological Seminary, and the distinguished English scholar, Canon Cheyne, as our guests. We have done honor to our members who have attained eminent distinction. We have welcomed those who were not our members, if they were of our faith, who by their character and by their training

* An address delivered at the Tenth Annual Meeting, held at the Hotel Manhattan, New York, January 27, 1907, with Mr. Justice M. Warley Platzek as guest of honor.

reflect honor upon our race, and we have had delightful, wholesome spiritual intercourse.

And so the ten years that have passed have not been entirely fruitless. It seems to me—and I have had my moments of doubt, because the group has not grown very much—it seems to me now—now more than ever, much more than when it came into existence—that there is need for just such a society. It needs no justification. The Jewish population of this town in the last ten years has increased more than in any ten years in the history of the Jewish community of any city. Twenty-two years ago, when I was engaged in the work of organizing the Hebrew Technical Institute, which had for its purpose to help in solving part of the problem of coping with that volume of immigration which had just begun to pour in, there were about 100,000 Jews in New York City. Ten years from now there will probably be a million and a quarter. And our Jewish problem, which is attracting so much attention on the part of sociologists and litterateurs, must have the attention of every educated brain and every sympathetic heart and every bit of intelligence in the entire Jewish community, because the Jewish community itself needs education as much as anybody else. The influx of the Jewish Russian has changed the attitude of those Jews who were here before, to the Jewish problem. We ourselves need education in an appreciation of the idealism, the power, and the value, of this stream of immigration sent by God to this land of freedom and opportunity. We have never before had such a spectacle as is exhibited in this city daily, of the marvelous transformation of men. I rub my eyes sometimes and think what has happened in twenty-five years under my own observation. Transformations! I have seen immigrants twenty-five years ago landing penniless on Ellis Island or Castle Garden, and now landed proprietors, merchant princes, teachers, principals of schools, in this imperial American city! Was there ever such a spectacle exhibited before in human history? Was there ever such a theater in the world before, where such a drama was being played as is now being played right under our eyes?

And we who have the benefits, the prior benefits, of this splendid advantage, given with such generous hospitality by

American institutions and American environment, we owe it to ourselves and to our brethren to consider how we can contribute by the maintenance of our ideals—because it is idealism, idealism which is the only thing that is truly Jewish in the world—not materialism, but idealism—how far we can contribute to the maintenance of what we are pleased to style in our rhetorical manner the banner of Israel.

I said that I consider that this society is more necessary now than ever before, because the problems are more pressing. The tragedies of the last two or three years have had one beneficial effect: they have knit together all persons of Jewish blood in a manner that no other means could have brought about. A wave of human sympathy has spread all over the world, and we in America are members of the same family that is suffering under the iron heel of the Czar. And so every man who has received the benefits of a collegiate education, every man who has thought on the subject of the welfare of the Jews, every man who takes an interest in charitable, educational, uplifting work among this community, should be a member of this association. We want to make it a democracy, not a plutocracy. We want to make it democratic, so that there shall be no German Jew, no Russian Jew and no Polish Jew here, but only intelligent men, united in a common purpose to help interpret Jewish idealism.

I am glad, as I look over the roster of our membership, small as it is, that we have a group of men of high ideals and pure motives. I find in the list men who have not waited until they have amassed fortunes or secured position before engaging in the work of benefiting their fellowmen, but men who from their boyhood have felt the glow of pride in altruistic work. I see to-night several who from their school days up to their present mature manhood, kept up and maintained the high enthusiasms which they kindled in their youth. And to impart that enthusiasm to the generation that is to come, to transmit the torch to those who are soon to take our places, what better could justify this purpose than this group, bearing the name of "The Judæans"?

And so I hope that in the ten years now opening we shall flourish and grow and increase in number and in influence.

The real makers of a nation, someone has said, are its poets,

its preachers, its seers, its teachers, its thinkers. We want to make this, as I said, a gathering, if you like, of the dreamers in Israel, because it is the dreamer that lives forever; it is the toiler who dies in a day. What can we do? Why, we can take interest in many questions, that are now before the whole group of Jews in America! Recently a committee of 50 or 60 was appointed to consider grave questions that came up in an emergency. What better topic could a group like this have for consideration than the nature, influence and scope of such a committee—a representative committee? What does it represent? How shall that representation be brought about for the mass of Jews not affiliated with congregational organizations? We have a subject in our own midst, the question of the federation of the Jewish charitable organizations. It seems to me that a group of this kind should consider such things, and I have felt that there should be an educational federation, because the chief question that affects the Jewish life of this community, in order to maintain the idealism which should suffuse the best part of the community, is the religious training and education of youth, and with increase of population the difficulty of this religious training is one of the most complex that could meet our consideration.

When Judge Rosalsky the other night, in addressing the Young Men's Hebrew Association, said—he himself an illustration of the magic power of transformation to which I have referred,—when he himself says that as a judge it has pained him to see how crime has increased among the young Jewish lads, how many sentences he has had to pass upon boys of Jewish parentage—I say it becomes a body like this to devote itself not entirely to social intercourse, spending "Attic nights," but to considering how we can contribute to the solution of that difficult problem. And this body, too, has a right to have its voice heard upon that other "menace" which raises itself almost like a portent, the restriction of immigration. Why, the city of New York itself is an answer to any restriction of immigration. New York itself owes all its success, certainly 75 per cent. of its success, to the immigrants who come to it; and this body, dignified, intelligent, should be a unit in preparing itself to resist the de-Americanization of our institutions, as they would be de-Americanized

if undue restrictions were placed upon immigration. When we reflect that the Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York at one end of the line, and the man who sits at Ellis Island to watch and guard the country against bad immigration at the other, both of them came over here as immigrants, we have a type of the men that have come to this city and honored it by their presence. It is not as laborers alone—and we need them enough, heaven knows—but as laborers in the intellectual and moral sphere, that we should extend a hearty and generous welcome to every human being who wants to escape from the old world and come here where he can stand erect; for America must always, always mean opportunity to every human being. That it is opportunity (if you will pardon me a few words more) is illustrated by the signal distinctions that come. Read of the atrocities to our martyred brethren in the Far East. Return to the West. Here are men whom we see—a pleasing picture. We see one of our citizens, one whom we can really consider one of our own number, raised to be a confidential adviser to one of the most sympathetic Presidents that ever filled that exalted station. The very nomination and selection of Mr. Straus as a member of the President's Cabinet, not alone is a compliment to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, but it shows the large-mindedness, the freedom from prejudice, of the man who is our present executive. It is pleasing, I say, to turn from the spectacle of Russia to the spectacle of this country, where the Jew can raise his head and be honored.

And not he alone, because, of the twenty-three who are now on the Supreme Court of the State of New York of the First Judicial Department, three of them are members of this society. And we meet to-night in especial honor of one who has just recently been elevated thereto.

From what we know of his history, what we know of his purposes, from a long and intimate acquaintanceship, we feel sure that when the time shall come that he will lay down his judicial robes of office, that the people will say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." We gather to-night to bid him godspeed in the new enterprise on which he has embarked, for the honor of himself and the credit of his people and the glory of his city,

and we feel that this impulse, this handshake, that we are giving him will be taken in the spirit that it is given.

Let me add as supplement that in a court perhaps only slightly inferior in jurisdiction and in an office that gets close to the people, we are glad that the Mayor has exercised his wisdom in giving judicial honors to Henry W. Unger, also a member of this group, and we wish him success and distinction in his new field, and we hope that he may so conduct his high office that when the time comes for him to lay it down, it shall be said to him, "Go up higher." (Applause.)

And so, ladies and gentlemen, in this unprepared way (because I did not expect to be here until very late), I give a foretaste of the things that are to come. I hope sincerely that every man of the sixty or seventy who joined the society some years ago will maintain loyalty to it, and that we may usher in a new era of working together for the purely idealistic purposes of the society. I hope that every man, no matter with what other committee or organization he may be identified, will knit himself to this body, and help to make it a power for great good in this city among the Jews. And I cannot sit down now without referring to the absence from this meeting of one dear devoted worker, one soulful friend, who all his life worked in the Jewish spirit, with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might. He has gone before us; he leaves behind him the legacy of a life well spent. We can well devote a moment of thought to our dear departed friend, Isaac S. Isaacs.

THE FUNCTION OF JEWISH SCHOLARSHIP *

BY JOSEPH JACOBS

YOUR circumstances, gentlemen, are somewhat different from ours in London. What we found, in originally starting the Maccabæans was, that the Jews who were pursuing a professional career were gradually drifting away from communion with their fellow Jews, and losing the Jewish spirit. Here in New York, so far as I can observe, there is little danger of that. Your numbers are so great that, like the inhabitants of the Scilly Islands who earned a precarious livelihood by taking in one another's washing, you can manage to pursue your professional careers by doctoring one another, educating one another, or advising each other on legal affairs. But, though your institution is not called upon to perform the principal function which the parent body, if I may so call it, has to perform in London, you have naturally your own problems to meet in this huge city, and a special part to play in the organization of the Jewish community in New York, if we can speak of such a thing. One of the minor sections of your activity you are carrying through this evening in the kind hospitality you are offering to myself, for which I beg to return you my sincere thanks. It is indeed a pleasure to me to meet so many kindred spirits in this collective manner, though I am happy to think that in the majority of cases I have had the pleasure of seeing most of you individually before. It seems most natural to an Englishman to inaugurate his public career by something in the nature of a dinner.

You have recently, gentlemen, produced the first volume of your transactions, and a fine volume it makes, both externally and internally. I find that these occasions are mostly devoted by the speakers of the evening to some wide topic, in which the

* From an address delivered at the annual meeting of the Judæans, May 8, 1900.

fortunes of Jews or Judaism are surveyed from the shores of China to the coast of Peru. I will venture, if I may, to follow the same example, and shall treat in short outline what I consider to be the function of Jewish scholarship in the present condition of American Judaism. It might seem somewhat daring on my part to venture to speak on American Judaism, having so short an acquaintance with it, but I may get over that difficulty by recognizing in the start that I know nothing about it except that there is no such thing as American Judaism. There are at the present moment any number of Judaisms in America, ranging from the severe agnosticism of the Ethical Culture Movement, if we may call that Judaism, to the wildest mysticism of the later Cabbala and Chassidism. But the interest in your country, gentlemen, from a Jewish point of view, is just in this heterogeneity. We may see in this very city survivals of every stage of historic Judaism. There co-exist side by side in New York, American Jews of the past, of the present and of the future. Your history in this regard is of extreme interest as exemplifying the stages which Judaism in general has passed through in the century just ending. At the beginning, Jews were Jews unconsciously and traditionally, because their fathers had been Jews before them, and they felt, without knowing it, the attraction of the home and synagogal customs of the race. Then came that wave of reflection and criticism which spread from Germany, the home of rationalism, and attempted to reconcile the old world religion with the conditions of modern life. In both Europe and America this was represented by what is known as the Reform Movement, one great American leader of which has only just passed away since my arrival in this country. There can be no doubt that in some directions it did a great deal of good; it stirred the dead bones and breathed into them the life of reason. It rendered possible the living of the modern life along with devotion to something of the old Jewish spirit. But it failed in one special direction, which has proven almost fatal to its vitality. It failed to appeal to men's (and women's) imagination and thus it left them cold. Without imagination, gentlemen, no religion, no nation can live. Even on the merely intellectual side, the absence of imagination prevents a due appreciation of

the historic side of religion. It is a mistake to think that the mere removal of a certain amount of inconvenience is true reform. From some points of view these inconveniences have their attraction to the nobler spirits; there may be a sensual pleasure in fasting. No one can say that the Reform Movement, either in this country or Europe, has shown any powers of attracting the modern Jew, and we are all looking out on both sides of the Atlantic for something which will appeal to the deeper and finer chords of nature than mere reason, the main motive power of the German form of Judaism which is ruling in this country almost up to the present day.

But within the last twenty years or so, a new exodus of Israel has taken place from the Russian house of bondage, which has materially altered the condition of affairs throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, upon which has been thrown the main burden. You yourselves have, with a self-devotion at which I can never cease to marvel, taken upon yourselves, or had thrust upon you, the heaviest burden resulting from Russian tyranny. The result is that, whereas twenty-five years ago American Judaism was predominantly German, at the present moment it is predominantly Russian. In other words, the center of gravity has been shifted from German rationalism to Russian intensity and nationalism. Yet, owing to social conditions, the leading spirits of American Jewry still remain German, while the people who should be led are Russians, in every sense of the word. Now, I do not know whether you have noticed a certain antipathy which seems to exist between the German and Russian Jew, though the latter in the last resort traces his culture from Germany, whose language he still retains. Social conditions are changing with that remarkable celerity which is so characteristic of the States. The Russians are moving up-town and it requires little powers of prophecy to foresee the time when the German element will recede in social matters somewhat in the same way as the Sefardic element has been deposed within a century. The future of American Judaism is with the Russian Jew. He has his faults, as is indeed conspicuously obvious. But he has this quality of imagination which was the one thing needful in the German Reform Movement, and I, for one, anticipate the happiest results in the

union of German reason and Russian tradition, since reason and tradition have been the indispensable amalgam which has made up Judaism.

Such being the condition of American Judaism, there is a peculiarly appropriate function for Jewish scholarship to play in welding together the rational and the traditional elements. Whatever else it may be, Judaism is above all things a historic religion. Its great strength consists in this, that it has passed through all the stages of men's history and bears upon its body the traces, one might almost say scars, of all the centuries. This has at any rate one advantage, that whatever wing of Judaism you belong to, you can find historic warrant for your position in one of the many phases through which Judaism has passed. Thus, for example, you were not, gentlemen, the first to invent the Sunday Sabbath. The Jews in Mohammedan Spain were inclined to adopt a Friday Sabbath. The rationalism of the German Movement has its analogue in the philosophic movement of Arabic Spain, the mysticism of Chassidism is almost lineally connected with the Cabbala of Palestine. No new religion can ever find this same breadth of historic relationship, and with the revival of the century the two great historic religions, Catholicism and Judaism, have deepened in intensity while they have broadened in toleration. Now it is the function of scholarship to connect the present day with the historic movements of the past. What the scholar attempts to do is to connect that very feeling of his own soul with the souls of men like himself in the great movement of the past. It is the past that has made us what we are and the true scholar can never be intolerant because he can find a historic justification for every section of Judaism even, or, perhaps I should say more particularly, for the orthodox element, which is historic to the core.

Well, gentlemen, in these few words I have attempted to justify my assertion, that in scholarship we are to find that reconciliation of reason and tradition that we are looking for in order to constitute the New Judaism. The practical question remains, where are we to find our scholars? Now, the answer to this would seem to be, in our Rabbis. I trust that I will not be misunderstood if I venture to express the opinion that it is

impossible for the modern Jewish minister to be a scholar in the strict sense of the word. Jewish science, if there be such a thing, is so complex, requires such an amount of linguistic, philosophical, theological and historical knowledge, that to be a Jewish scholar requires the whole devotion of a lifetime. Yet, what do you demand from your Rabbis? That they are to be practical philanthropists, learned in the latest laws of hygiene and social economy, they are to be preachers and teachers and men of the world, and even of society. Philanthropy nowadays is so elaborate that it requires man's whole attention. You cannot expect a man to be at once an expert in organized charity and a specialist student of mediæval Jewish poetry, or of Talmudic Law. In other branches of learning there are organized means of study at the University on the ordinary research lines. Jewish science has not yet been recognized by the outside world, it is scarcely recognized by Jews themselves as a study deserving of man's whole attention—*an und für sich*. The difficulty is not felt quite so much in Germany, where to some slight extent branches of Jewish science are organized at the Universities, but here there is absolutely no career for a man to devote himself purely to Jewish science; and while that is so, American Judaism will suffer for want of Jewish scholarship. Your theological colleges in this country scarcely propose to train a man in Jewish science. They give him, indeed, the rudiments of it, but just at the moment when he might begin to contribute something himself to the science, you ask him to be a visitor of the poor and of the rich, a preacher and an educator and a thousand other things, which make him more practically important in their way, but are not Jewish science.

Yet it is from his hands, from the hands of the Rabbi, that you require that reconciliation of reason and history, of science and tradition, of modern life and ancient customs, which constitute to my mind the central problem of modern Judaism, and it is indeed only from his hands that you can receive it. For the said reconciliation can only come from one who has a certain bias in that direction, whereas it is the essential condition of scholarly treatment that there should be absolutely no bias. It is a great mistake to think that he who studies the development

of religious thought must necessarily himself be religious, or that he that is attracted by the picturesqueness and romance of certain historic customs should feel obliged to keep up these customs himself. The scholar should keep himself rigidly impartial in such practical matters, except in so far as impartiality may destroy sympathy.

I trust I have made myself clear. The central problem of American Judaism, as of all religion, is to reconcile the claims of the present and the past. To present the claims of the past is the function of the Jewish scholar and requires his whole devotion. The modern Jew, either consciously or unconsciously, stands for the claims of the present. Between the two stands the Rabbi, who often through too practical experience knows the urgent demands of the present, and from the condition of his training and his calling can be but imperfectly equipped with a knowledge of Israel's past. It should be the function of modern Jewish scholarship to present the evolutionary stages of Jewish history in such a form that the Rabbi can proceed to his task of reconciliation, and the crucial difficulty of the whole problem is, that there is no definite career open for one who is attracted to the study of Judaism by a passionate love and devotion for the subject itself, which should constitute the driving motive of true scholarship. The scholar must be attracted to his researches by the fascination of the subject itself and not be diverted by any interest in practical things or even any ideal aim besides.

Indeed, the fascinations of Jewish science and theology are, to my mind, so great, that I often wonder that they have not attracted more attention from the outer world and that we do not hear of more Gentile students and lecturers on Jewish History and Theology.

On further reflection I am not surprised, for the central problem of Jewish science is the analysis of the Jewish spirit, that mysterious bond of communion which makes us all brothers throughout the world. When you think of it, gentlemen, it is an amazing phenomenon. Here we are in this room, possibly of all phases of religion, certainly taking our Judaism in very many senses which in the outside world would be held to constitute different creeds. We are of many nationalities and possibly, in

the last resort, of several races. Yet we feel between us a bond which it is not mere metaphor to call one of brotherhood. Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Israel, there exists between them a spirit of community which among other men is only found between members of the same family or in the closest and most strongly tried friendship. You doubtless know the history of the Pollak who had "arrived" and took his seat in a parlor car, which we benighted Europeans call a first-class carriage, and was on his best behavior till his fellow traveler took out of his pocket a *luach*, whereupon our friend threw himself down on the cushions, with a sigh of relief, saying "Azoï." He felt at once at home in the presence of a fellow Jew. So, too, my friend Lucien Wolf went to interview the late Baron de Hirsch for the London *Daily Graphic*. The Baron was naturally somewhat distant in his behavior, until, catching sight of my friend's rather pronounced features, he said: "You are a Jew, are you not?" and at once relaxed. Friend Wolf's comment was: "No Jew can put on side (or, as you say, put on lugs) in the presence of a fellow Jew."

Gentlemen, it is the final aim of Jewish science to study the inner side of that remarkable feeling of fellowship which binds Jew to Jew throughout the climes and throughout the ages. What is its origin and what is its means of preservation, whether it is due to religion or race or nationality, or a unique combination of all three; whether it is desirable to preserve it; whether it is possible to preserve; whether it has been for the good of the world, and whether it will be—all these are questions which raise in a concrete, and almost exciting form, the profoundest problems of man's destiny. The old folk regarded it with reverence and called it divine. We are a little more modest nowadays and content ourselves with calling it mysterious. Yet we mean pretty much the same as the old folk, and in our heart of hearts feel confident that this remarkable bond does not merely exist in order that Jew may meet Jew with that feeling of friendliness with which every man should greet his brother-man. Or that it should be quite the natural thing that a London Maccabæan, or perhaps I should say an Australian Maccabæan, should be welcomed as one of themselves by New York Judæans.

THE MISSION OF "THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA" *

BY DR. K. KOHLER

I AM glad and thankful for the opportunity presented by the Judæans, its president and members, of celebrating the occasion of the appearance of the first volume of *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. I am glad to be able to offer thanksgiving in the old spirit of the Jew who thanked God on every occasion of proud joy and on every novel experience, "for having been permitted to live and see the gladsome day," and also to offer thanksgiving in an altogether new sense, the thanksgiving of the Jew to a Christian house, for having undertaken a work which bids fair to do more for the vindication of Jews and Judaism, and for the removing of prejudice and false impression regarding them, than any social or legislative measure could do. I do not exaggerate when saying that few people, even in this circle of well-informed men, realize the importance of *The Jewish Encyclopedia* which, were it not for the energy and perseverance, the liberality and broadness of mind, and above all, the faith in progressive humanity and in humanity's God which pervades Dr. Funk and his associates, could never have been brought to such a successful issue. All credit to Dr. Isidor Singer, who first conceived this great plan, and for years agitated and discussed its feasibility with the scholars of Europe and America. Still, neither he nor any one of us, the editors and publishers, had a clear conception of the magnitude of the undertaking, nor of the difficulties it had to encounter.

Enthusiasm and zeal for a unique enterprise, not prospect of lucre, spurred us all on to work amidst heart-burnings and misgivings, anxiety and disappointment. On the very day we held

* Address delivered May 21, 1901, at a meeting held in honor of the publication of *The Jewish Encyclopedia*.

our first meeting for organization, the news was flashed across the ocean that one of the greatest and most productive Jewish scholars on whose cooperation we had counted, Prof. David Kaufmann, had suddenly ended his brilliant career. The foregone conclusion that nothing good can come from America proved to be another source of annoyance. But undaunted by fear and discouragement, we went on our way, and to-day we glory in an achievement which is a triumph of American industry and enterprise. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, both as to its contents and its typographical and lithographical execution, will be a surprise to the Jewish as well as to the non-Jewish world, an ornament to every public or private library.

The Jewish Encyclopedia should be hailed and welcomed as a benefactor, as a source of light and instruction in every Jewish home. On its pages are written the words inscribed over the gate of the temple at Delphi: Gnothi Seauton—"Know Thyself." How little does the Jew know of his own history and literature! How few are familiar with the names and achievements of their own great men, and the places occupied by them in the history of the world's culture and progress. And who possesses the knowledge, comprehensive and many-sided enough, to form a correct judgment, a right opinion, of Jewish life and thought in all its relations to the world, past and present, social, intellectual and religious? *The Jewish Encyclopedia* will carry the required information into every household far better than a whole library with thousands of Hebrew or Jewish volumes can, because it is not for the student only, but for all who may use it as a mere reference book by way of discussion and casual inquiry.

The Jewish Encyclopedia goes forth at the beginning of a new century to perfect the emancipation of the Jew wrought by the nineteenth century, and set forth his claims to recognition before the tribunal of the world, as no other power can. It will, at last, make the Jew thoroughly understood. It offers no plea or argument, but terse, incontrovertible facts. It neither flatters nor whitewashes the Jew, but presents him as he is and was, with his virtues and vices, his merits and demerits, his strength and his weaknesses, with all his noble traits as well as his frailties and idiosyncrasies. Pointing to its contents, the Jew will say to his

fellow-citizens and fellow-men throughout the world: Many of you have hated me, some loved me, others ignored me, while most of you have simply tolerated me, but none has thoroughly learned to know me and see me as I am, or striven to put himself in my place, to understand my relation to the social structure of which I am an integrating part, to the civilization in which I have played no insignificant rôle, to the religious and intellectual systems and currents of thought, to which I have contributed no mean share. Look at this faithful record of my life throughout the centuries, and see whether, with all my shortcomings, I am not the peer and equal of any other race, class or sect.

The Jewish Encyclopedia goes forth as a peacemaker and friendly intermediary between all shades of opinion among the Jews, between Orthodoxy and Reform, Radicalism and Conservatism, Nationalist and Cosmopolitan, as well as between Jew and non-Jew, between the mother synagogue and its daughters, church and mosque, between all creeds and classes. It will open the eyes of Jew and non-Jew to the many points of contact, to the many historical relations and the interchange of thoughts that bind them together, to the many elements of humanity, to the serious thought and healthy wit and humor, to the spiritual and the material interests they have in common. Neither rabbi nor priest, neither scientist nor philanthropist, Jew or non-Jew will open the volume of the *Encyclopedia* without learning to say with new zest: *Homo sum et nil humani a me alienum puto*, "I am a man and nothing that is human shall henceforth remain alien to me."

But the work has only been fairly begun. It requires the hearty support and cooperation of all, the business and the professional men, the scholars and philanthropists, the leading men of the Jewish and the non-Jewish world, to carry the gigantic undertaking to a successful and glorious end.

Let the Judæans that have assembled here to-night to celebrate the epoch-making event, become enthusiastic missionaries for the noble work which will redound to the credit not only of the publishers and editors, but of our country and our century.

DR. SCHECHTER AND JEWISH SCHOLARSHIP IN AMERICA *

BY DR. EMIL G. HIRSCH, OF CHICAGO

THE significant words of the traditional blessing, prescribed for sanctifying the hour when to ordinary mortal the privilege is granted to behold face to face one of the great and learned masters of the Torah, spontaneously rise to my lips. For indeed the scholar whom we are gathered to welcome to his new sphere of enlarged activity and influence has high rank among the chosen students of the monuments which Jewry and Judaism have created as the records and depositaries of their experience, their confidence, their innermost convictions, their hopes, their faith. If any one among the now living has brought home to us the supreme certainty that Torah means infinitely more than the written text of the Pentateuch, that it connotes the vast domain of Jewish thought and speculation, of practice and reasoning, throughout the ages of Israel's existence on earth, it is he who, coming among us, brings to the New World the assurance that even on these Western shores the storehouse of Jewish aspiration and conviction, once erected, will shelter not merely the old, but even more abundantly, new manifestations and monuments of Jewish searching and Jewish self-expression.

You, and I not least among you, reverently bow before his superior learning, and humbly, but devoutly repeat the simple, yet so stirring and significant phrasing of the old benediction: "Blessed be He who in His grace hath imparted of His wisdom to such as revere Him."

I look for a turn in the tide of Jewish life and labor in this land of ours. No longer the immediate and pressing needs of the poorer and less fortunate among our number will hold the

* Words spoken at the banquet given in welcome of Dr. S. Schechter by the Judeans, May 29, 1902.

exclusive attention and whet the dominant solicitude of our men of light and leading hereafter. True it is, none among us but willingly will continue to bear his share of the burden which circumstances not of our choosing and the bigotry of distant empires have imposed on us. We are in honor pledged to see to it that none of Jacob's fugitive sons become a public charge. That was the promise given the authorities by the first of Israel's band who set foot on what is now the Eastern shore of the Republic. We are glad to feel that in us has not yet been dulled that sentiment which old Writ invokes as distinctive qualification of our own mental and moral orientation. Ye know the soul of the stranger was urged upon our remote ancestors' consideration. That strangers most of us have been, we shall not lose out of sight. Helping hand will by us not be withheld from the hundreds of thousands forced to leave the land where their cradle rocked and their grandfathers lie buried, asking and hoping among us to find not riches, but the right to live the human life.

This very readiness to come to the aid of the oppressed, to steady tottering feet and uphold wavering hands however, is shadowed by grave onesidedness. It is to be feared that charity, to use a term not to my liking, has come to be regarded by many as the only implication of Jewishness. Indications are not few that an increasing number of Jews look upon their contributions to the various charitable agencies as the full equivalent of Jewish loyalty. That there is hunger for other sustenance than what is given by bread, and that it cries out for nourishment, is about to be recognized in our circle. And Dr. Schechter has come among us at the opportune time.

Whatever be our controversies and dissensions, clear it must be that in the last analysis scholarship alone may be invoked to render the decision or justify the position, whatever it be, of the dissenting disputants. That suspicion certainly must be discarded which insinuates that ignorance is at the bottom of the theories advanced by the innovators in the synagogue. Let it be borne in mind that the leaders of what is falsely labeled Reform in Germany were without exceptions great masters of Jewish knowledge and lore. If the ignorant is denied the possibility of being respected for piety, he is as clearly incapacitated for the duties

of him who would propound and expound the views underlying the liberal synagogue's practices.

For the Reform Rabbi perhaps the duty to familiarize himself with the content of Jewish literature is still more imperative than it may be for the conformer with the routine regularities of conservative custom. He does not look upon the documents transmitted by his predecessors as creations of heaven, yet he must read them and study them all the more lovingly, because they open unto him the peep into the innermost laboratory of Jewish thinking and hoping. His own outlook upon life, his uplook into time yet to be, cannot be a new departure. It is a continuation, a modification of precedent, conviction and consciousness. To search the past, to live in the present, to build for the future, said Geiger, is the task and ambition of the Jewish Reformer. Yet without scholarship the past remains a book sealed with seven seals, unreadable.

Whatever be the differences which separate Dr. Schechter's interpretation of that common heritage of ours and that which I may have accepted, his researches I must be the last to ignore. His contributions to the certainties of former Jewish thought and intention are essential to my preparations, my equipments, as a would-be teacher of liberal Judaism. Knowledge of Jewish Torah connoting all the manifestations and self-expressions of Jewish mentality and spirituality as moulded by the experience of Jewry is the indispensable prerequisite without which none may presume to speak for Judaism or of Judaism in the pulpit and before men. We of the Reform wing, so labeled, rejoice no less than do his closer partisans in the advent of Dr. Schechter. Our hopes, winged high by his joining our forces in America, are no less sanguine than are those of the men in the main instrumental in shaping his resolve. He will give impetus to Jewish scholarship in the new world. Perhaps largely through him it will come to pass that our seminaries and academies will rise to influence and fame as wide and beneficent as was wielded and enjoyed by the seats of learning and authority in Babylon or Spain and in late decades in Germany.

Hitherto American Israel has, and that not very generously, provided for the training of preachers. I make bold to predict

that from now on, also the scholar will be given place and recognition in our preoccupations. The beginning has been made. As yet it is modest, but in Biblical words it will be in the end very highly exalted. Yisgeh Meod. I plead for the endowing of Jewish fellowships of the order in vogue in the British Universities. Let us provide modest sustenance for gifted men who would give years to the task of investigating and publishing Jewish literary monuments, hidden away perhaps in libraries, and known now only to bibliographers by title. I plead for the creating of new opportunities for the restating in English of the content of the master books of Jewish origin and emphasis: a new Jewish English literature, as it were, devised to combat prejudice, mothered by ignorance. I am optimistic enough to read into the associations of this auspicious hour the prospect of realizing these various hopes of mine. He who has come to us will stimulate anew the interest for Jewish writings and research. As an humble provincial teacher I would ask him to permit me to bid him godspeed to his new duties, as well as to his old labors. I for one begin to regret that my home is not in your metropolis. For if it were I should beg of the master to allow me to sit as a learner at his feet in his classes. As it is, I, like many others, will be eager all the more to read whatever he may find it worth his while to lay on our desk in printed form. May a kind providence help him in the great work which is his to carry. The work of his hands may God establish upon him.

REBELLION AGAINST BEING A PROBLEM *

BY DR. SOLOMON SCHECHTER

OF all the various banquets and receptions given in honor of great men which it has ever been my privilege to attend, none has afforded me more gratification than the opportunity offered to me of being present at this dinner, given in honor of our revered guest, Monsieur Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, Member of the Institute of France. For thus, said Rabbi Abin, who apparently plagiarized Carlyle some fifteen centuries before the Scotch seer wrote his *Heroes and Hero Worship*: "He who sits at the festive board at which the true sage and scholar is entertained, enjoys a foretaste of that bliss which man experiences by direct communion with the Divine." It is in such moments of grace that genius relaxes into geniality, and elaborate learning expands into wit and *esprit*, and deep thought takes the shape of that delightful and profitable proverbial wisdom which has created our "table-talk literature," and of which the speeches just delivered have given you such a fine specimen.

The sense of gratification is increased by the feeling of gratitude which we all harbor toward the author of *Israel Among the Nations*. As a native of Roumania, I feel under an especial debt of gratitude toward our distinguished guest. The troubles of the Roumanian Jew begin with perceiving the light of the world. On the very day on which he receives his name, by which he is called up to the Torah in later life, he loses his civil and political rights, and becomes subject to all sorts of restrictive laws. On the occasion of my first fight with the boys of our Christian neighbors, I was warned not to hit back, as such a presumption on my part may bring serious misfortune upon the whole of the Jewish

* Address delivered at banquet in honor of Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, May 16, 1904.

community. On remonstrating that it is unfair that the Christian boys should enjoy all immunity in their fights, I was given to understand that we belonged to a people which is under the curse of being a problem, and that I must wait for an answer until the Jewish problem has found its proper solution. Naturally, I rebelled against being a problem, and I pondered a great deal over its meaning. I was perhaps a boy of twelve or fourteen when there fell into my hands a Hebrew translation of Josephus' *Contra Apion*, which I read with great interest, though it was only partially understood by me, and I well remember that I wondered whether our Christian neighbors had ever read "Apion," and whether this might not be the cause of their ill-will against us. I must say to their honor that they were not addicted to the reading of books, and that they were quite original in their hatred and Jew-baiting, but those were still the days when French influence was predominant on the shores of the Danube. When matters assumed dangerous proportions, there used to come messages from the West, echoing the voice of God and humanity, as revealed unto His servants who inaugurated the French Revolution, which made our neighbors understand that there is still a Providence in the world watching even over the destiny of the Jew.

With the year 1870, the reign of blood and iron began. Humanity was gradually deposed. A new generation arose which knew not the traditions of the French Revolution, and the "fifth-beast of Daniel" was let loose. Hatred and malice and envy and brutality of the worst kind were set free against a defenseless people. But what was worse, was that all these brutal instincts, till then held at bay by reason of public opinion, were raised to the dignity of an "ism," and the term "Anti-Semitism" was invented. The Jewish problem became more complicated every day, and a large literature was created. Instead of being a mere religious problem, we suddenly discovered ourselves to be also an ethnological problem, an economic problem, a social problem, a psychological problem, and ever so many more problems. I need hardly describe to you under what torture the Jew is, when wading through this degraded and degrading literature. It is actual vivisection, without the relief of anæsthetics. Some Mohammedan theologians are said to have seriously discussed

whether women have a soul. These anti-Semitic scribblers took it for granted that we have no soul, no sense of honor, no feelings of dignity, and were quite astonished when we showed signs of resentment.

You may then realize what a relief it was to come upon the work, *Israel Among the Nations*. It is a noble book. It is not the Jew who constitutes the problem for the author. It is rather the phenomenon that the Jew was made to constitute a problem in the nineteenth century. Just as a scientific investigator examines into the causes of an epidemic, our author subjects to an analysis the symptoms of the spiritual malady that has afflicted humanity. Jew and Christian alike are arraigned before his tribunal. The Jews do not escape censure. Indeed, we are not faultless. We raise no claim to perfection. But one always has the feeling that "those are the wounds inflicted by a friend." In Jewish angelology, the Angel Michael figures as "an Angel of Letters," or, as they expressed it, the Prince of Wisdom, but he is described at the same time as the friend and advocate of Israel. The savant Leroy-Beaulieu is a great man of letters in the best and widest sense of the word, but what he accomplished as an advocate of Israel, he has shown in the book just named. He not only attempts to reconcile us with the rest of the world, but also with ourselves, or with that section of the Jewish community which forms our particular problem. It is a Prince of Wisdom who offers us this wise counsel with regards to our problem:

"Some of the Jewish emigrants," he says, "have been obviously degraded and corrupted by centuries of oppression. Many years—perhaps one or two generations—will be needed to raise their moral plane, to imbue them with a sense of honor and dignity. It is a great mistake to believe that this moral uplifting can be facilitated by detaching them from their religion. On the contrary, the least praiseworthy Jews that I have met have generally been 'de-judaized' Jews, those who had ceased to observe the Mosaic law."

As a student of Jewish literature, it was only natural that I should be eager to learn the opinion of this great man of letters on the various productions of Jewish genius. An after-dinner

speech is not a fit occasion to enter into a learned discourse. But one general remark will not be out of place. My perusal of *Israel Among the Nations* impressed me as if M. Leroy-Beaulieu, who is himself a pious Christian, feels some anxiety about the fate of the Old Testament, under these attacks by the "higher" and "lower" anti-Semitism. To his comfort, and to the comfort of all gathered here, let me say that I am very hopeful in this respect. Perhaps I may reproduce here the following story from the Reverend Edward Everett Hale's book, *Lowell and His Friends*:

"I am not sure," our late Senatorial Chaplain says, "that this story of those days is quite decorous enough for print. But I will risk it. Professor Calvin Ellis Stowe, who was a classmate of Longfellow's, told me that in the early days of '61, he met Longfellow in the streets of Boston. Both of them were in haste, but Longfellow had time enough to ask if the Andover gentlemen were all alive to their duty to the nation. Stowe said he thought they were, and Longfellow said, 'If the New Testament won't do, you must give them the Old.'"

This is not said in disparagement of the New Testament. All that I desire to suggest is that the Old Testament is an elemental force of morality which humanity may neglect for a while, but with which it cannot dispense for any length of time. We shall never cease to profit by the Old Testament as long as there exists a sense of duty, and we shall return to it whenever the need of the Divine Imperative Will be felt deepest. As to the later developments of Hebrew literature, we must not forget that very little is known of it. We must recollect that the knowledge of post-Biblical Hebrew literature is still in its infancy. The magnificent work, *Les Rabbins Français*, which we owe to the French nation, has revealed only a small part of it. Jewish literature is eminently a religious literature with a Golden Legend of its own, and a continuous record of the experience and struggles of beautiful souls. But unfortunately, most of these litterateurs who have made it their main occupation in life to acquaint the world with this literature and the men who have created it, have not yet outgrown their rationalistic stage. Being mainly devoted to what I may call a *bourgeois* gospel or a *bour-*

geos Torah, and a Philistine conception of the universe, they were lacking in sympathy and depth of religious feeling, and devoid of all appreciation of mysticism and those qualities which make for saintliness and holiness. What I always admired in Renan was not so much his *Life of Jesus*, which is, indeed, largely antiquated now, nor his *History of the People of Israel*, in which, one, after having studied the works of Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Stade, and other "Fathers of the holy church of higher criticism," finds little that is entirely new and original—what I admired most in him was his essay on Francis of Assisi, where he showed himself a master in the art of religion, and proved that his liberal tendencies have not obscured his judgment upon saints and saintliness, though he saw the weak points both in their character and in their logic. We have the saints, but we are still lacking in Renans.

Another hint offered us for our guidance by our learned author is contained in the following passage. After paying us the compliment that we are a "prophetic people," M. Leroy-Beaulieu says, "Were the Jew and the Christian equally faithful—the one to the Gospel and the other to the Torah—the points of difference between them would be fewer than those of resemblance." These are fair stipulations to which all, both Jews and Christians, could subscribe with a good conscience, and it is for a reconciliation on such terms of loyalty to our past and devotion to our religion that peace is desired. An American writer, whose name escapes me, records the following pleasantry from Colonial times: "A youth among the Friends wished to espouse a fair Puritan maiden; but the Quakers disapproved his marrying out of their society, and the Congregationalists his marrying into theirs; so in despair he thus addressed her: 'Ruth, let us break from this unreasonable bondage. I will give up my religion, and thou shalt give up thine; and we will marry and go into the Church of England, and go to the devil together!'"

I hope that both Ruth and her sweetheart are in some parlor in Heaven. There are many mansions in the House of our Father, but I tell you frankly that I desire no bond of unity on the condition of our going to the devil, either Jew or Christian. The terms of M. Leroy-Beaulieu are such that we all go to

Heaven, where we shall meet him. But there is no hurry for such a meeting. This can wait "*bis ueber hundert und zwanzig jahr, zu gesund,*" as the Jewish expression is—and so let us all raise our glasses and drink to the happiness of the author of *Israel Among the Nations*.

JEWISH IMMIGRANTS AND JUDAISM IN THE UNITED STATES *

BY ANATOLE LEROY-BEAULIEU

IF I have accepted your invitation to address you, it is with the intention of testifying here publicly to what I have seen in America—a spectacle that is assuredly one of the greatest, most striking, I dare even say, most marvelous, one can encounter in that American land—the land of miracles as well as the land of liberty. With my own eyes I have seen thousands, hundreds of thousands, of human beings, outlaws in the Old World, who, with liberty, have found security, dignity—often, also, prosperity—beyond the ocean, who, in less than fifteen or twenty years, have been so completely transformed that it is sometimes hard to recognize them; a wonderful phenomenon that does equal honor to America and to Israel, to those Jews not long since persecuted who, in a few years, have succeeded in profiting by American tolerance and the conditions of existence in the New World.

As for me, I think that two things above all else have made the success, the greatness, the wealth, and, if you wish, the superiority of the United States. The first is that America is perhaps the only country in the world in which the institutions open the largest field to all the faculties, all the working powers, as well as to all initiative. The second is that on American soil, improved for two or three centuries by successive generations of colonists and pioneers, who have come from all the countries of Europe, the most energetic men have met, the best-tempered characters, the most enterprising spirits. From this meeting,

* After addressing the Judeans at their meeting of May 15, 1904, at which he was the guest of honor, the late Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu expanded his remarks and delivered them as an address before the *Société des Etudes Juives* in Paris, December 18, 1904. We reprint a translation of this notable address, prepared for the *Jewish Comment* for its issue of May 26, 1905.

perhaps unique in history, institutions that assure the freest play to human activity, and men most capable of using this liberty, naturally was to result a prodigious development in every sense—economic, industrial, commercial, political. Among all the colonists who have for three centuries been driven to the shores of America by religious intolerance or political tyranny, the spirit of enterprise, or the spirit of independence, none, perhaps, since the Puritans of the Mayflower, have been led there by nobler motives than these sons of Israel, banished from Europe by the injustice of the laws or the intolerance of the customs; none, in quitting the Old World for a new continent, have brought to it more resolution, energy, initiative—that is to say, precisely the qualities that have made the expansive force and incomparable strength of American civilization.

I ardently wished to see for myself how these victims of the prejudices of the Old World were acclimatized, materially and morally, in this country of Washington and Lincoln, so different from those they had to leave. I confess that is one of the reasons for which I decided, despite my old aversion to the sea, to cross the Atlantic. I was eager to see on the spot, in their new home, those Jews of Russia, Roumania, Galicia, whom I had formerly studied in the country of their origin. I knew most of the Jewries of Europe, Asia and Africa. I still had to make myself familiar with what the Americans improperly call the ghettos of the New World. I have stated, with shame for our Europe, the undeserved sufferings of the Jews of the East; I should be happy to see how the Jews of Russia or of Roumania, who, it was maintained, were unworthy of liberty, have been able to show themselves worthy of it and to profit by it in the great democratic republic.

There are today about 1,300,000 or 1,400,000 Jews in the United States; more than half are massed in New York. At present, at the end of this year 1904, there are in Greater New York about 700,000 Jews. This figure, which I have already mentioned to some of my friends present, seemed exaggerated; I was able to verify on the spot that it is exact. In 1903, 80,000 Jews disembarked in the United States, nearly all in New York; only about 13,000 left for the interior of the country.

Immigration is not the only cause of the growth every year of the Jewish population of New York and of the United States; we must add the natural increase of this Jewish population by the excess of births over deaths. On the other hand, to appreciate the real importance of Jewish immigration, and not to exaggerate the effects of it on American life, it must be recalled that in certain years of the last century Europe sent almost 1,000,000 immigrants to the United States. However considerable Jewish immigration may seem to-day, it rarely exceeds and does not always reach the tenth part of the annual immigration.

When you examine these American Jews, you are struck with this fact: that more than half, perhaps, were not born on American soil; the greater part landed within a score of years, since the wicked "May laws" came to aggravate the condition, already so pernicious, of the Russian Jews; that is, since the beginning of the reign of Emperor Alexander III. If the Jews of Russia land on the shores of America by thousands every year, it is because the rigor of the Russian laws, intolerance and insecurity drive them, despite themselves, from the land of their birth. Numerous as are those who resign themselves to this hard exile, it is far from true that the exodus of Russian Jews to America is general. First, to leave Russian soil and cross the ocean it is necessary to have the means to travel across Europe and the Atlantic. Then, if the laws of the United States do not forbid immigration, they take certain precautions against immigrants; they demand that each of them should have a sum of at least \$10. The question is even up at the present moment of setting up barriers to the entrance into America, in order to oppose a dyke to the tide of immigration. In consequence of these difficulties or exigencies, the Jews who cross the Atlantic form a sort of select body. The most enterprising, the most robust, the better off or the least wretched, alone succeeded in leaving the Northern empire. As long as twenty years ago I wrote in the *Empire des Tsars* that emigration could not solve the Jewish question. I said: Thousands will leave; millions will remain. That is exactly what has happened. Great as has been the emigration from the somber Russian ghetto, it has but grazed the Jewish population of the vast empire. The Jews are too numerous there for that. The

Jewish question in Russia could not be solved by emigration. At most, it would not be impossible for a little country like Roumania.

A man of enterprising spirit, well known to many among you, Dr. Singer, promoter of the great *Jewish Encyclopedia*, has expressed the opinion that the American Jews must make up their minds to have the greatest number of their co-religionists in Russia come to America. This is not the sentiment of the Jews of the United States. This huge scheme does not seem practical to them. It seems rather the sort of thing to discredit Jewish immigration.

The solution of the Russian Jewish question is in Russia. It can be found only in Russia. In the great Slavic empire, as elsewhere, this grave problem can be solved only by liberty and equality of rights; but with liberty and equality the question would easily be decided. The hour is perhaps approaching when the Russian government will be ready to concede to the Jews the liberty to which they have a right. I thought I could give their friends in America this hope.

The great war, the frightful war that desolates Asia and grieves the whole world, seems destined to renovate Russia. For this country, internally, it will have lasting consequences and, perhaps a most fortunate one. Such is, at least, the feeling of most of my Russian friends. As a Frenchman, I cannot pretend to speak here in the name of Russian society; but I may be permitted to say that the writers of St. Petersburg and Moscow are almost unanimous in demanding liberty and equality for all the subjects of the Czar, regardless of origin or religion. Thus will the Jewish question be solved. And we Frenchmen, the allies of Russia, who would like to see her united and prosperous, we have the duty to raise our voice to aid in the accomplishment of this great work of justice and tolerance which will bring honor to the sovereign equitable enough to initiate it, and which will bring back to Russia in both hemispheres the sympathy of which she is too often deprived these days.

I said, to you, ladies and gentlemen, that one of the things that took me to America was the eager desire to see the Jews of New York. On the day after my arrival, or the day after that, I directed my steps toward the Jewish quarter of the East

Side. There are at present three or four Jewish quarters in New York, or, as they say over there, three or four ghettos. The chief is that of the East Side, where 350,000 or perhaps 400,000 Jews live. This quarter of lower New York was formerly inhabited by immigrants of different origin, chiefly by Irish; but as the Jews arrived and formed more compact groups, the others withdrew toward other quarters. While penetrating this ghetto, so to speak, the biggest and most populous in the world, I thought I should encounter something similar to what I had seen in Russia or Turkey. I was surprised to discover a very different spectacle. The East Side ghetto, indeed, constitutes a Jewish city in the bosom of the enormous American metropolis, but it has not the sordid aspect of the ghettos of Russia or of the Orient. The inhabitants of this quarter of New York have the Jewish air, they are Jews, and do not conceal the fact; but many have already acquired something that is American. I have been able to verify what I have often remarked elsewhere, that this famous Jewish type, attributed to all Jews, is far from being the same everywhere. The types vary greatly, although the greatest number of Jews on the East Side are Poles or Russians. I expected to find streets, houses, that did not shine with cleanliness. I shall not say that the streets, the courts in which the Jews live are comparable to the grand avenues of New York; I was nevertheless struck at discovering less filth and less misery than I had feared. The principal arteries of the East Side with their large shops, their banks, their establishments of all kinds, have ever an air of well being, of prosperity, of activity in all forms, which does great honor to the dwellers there. Everywhere one feels an intense life, at once Jewish and American, which astonishes the stranger.

It is impossible not to recognize the superiority of the American Jewish city over the Jewish city of Galicia or Little Russia. The external appearance, the bearing of the young people, of children, is particularly interesting. They have been rapidly transformed; they have already acquired an American aspect. The evil of the East Side is that the lodgings are too small for the population; that a very large number of families are there huddled in too restricted a space. Despite that, the ghetto of New York

seems to me to surpass that of London. There, it seems to me, you see more life, more energy, more self-confidence, more success or well-being.

On my return from America I stayed in London several days in order to make a comparison. The situation of the Jews in London would seem much more favorable. It offers fewer difficulties, since the Jews of the English metropolis scarcely exceed 150,000 in number. There is, indeed, in London also a sort of ghetto in the East End, the eastern part of the city toward White-chapel; but, again, the external aspect of New York seems to me superior to that of London, although in London also, among the 100,000 inhabitants of the ghetto, there are many immigrants from Russia and Poland. If those of New York seemed superior to me, that is due perhaps to the fact that among the immigrants from the east of Europe, the most enterprising or those best off have made their way to America. The more timid or the poorer have had to stop in England. It must be said, however, in praise of England and the English Jews, that with respect to dwellings and hygienic conditions the London ghetto seems preferable to the East Side, if not to the other ghettos of New York.

In the streets of the East Side you see signs and notices in all languages—jargon in Hebrew characters, Russian, Polish, German, Roumanian, sometimes even in Lithuanian. News-vendors offer you five or six different papers, most printed in Hebrew letters, some partly in jargon, partly in English. One thing of great interest is the special theatre for the Jewish population. New York has four or five of these theatres; Philadelphia two or three. Pieces written by Jews are played in jargon. Actors, sometimes of great renown, all Jews, too, are warmly applauded. These shows are curious, because they are truly popular. Whole families are present in the audience, children with their parents. I had once written that if the jargon were transported to America it would not live there long. It will have a longer life there than I ever thought, because every year brings a new contingent of immigrants who love to talk Yiddish with one another. As all the children learn English, as the young generation uses English more and more, in the long run, in 25 years, in a-half century, the jargon will, however, end by disappearing.

The first question that obtrudes itself upon the observer in the ghettos of the United States is this: How have these hundreds of thousands of immigrants been able to find the means of existence on American soil? Think of the formidable problem that faced the American Jews when the great Russian exodus began! There were 100,000 Jews in New York. Picture what was said of them: In less than 25 years you will have to receive more than a half million of your coreligionists from the Old World, and for all these fugitives you will have to find dwellings and means of existence. It can be affirmed that in solving such a problem American Judaism has displayed superior capacity, intelligence and self-devotion. Such a work does honor to America and to American institutions, but a good part of the success is due also to the exiles who landed on these new shores without resources. They set to work, and, aided by their brethren, they quickly accomplished the miracle of honestly earning their living. Today there are scarcely any trades in which you do not find Jewish workingmen. There are, indeed, some trades in which they are more numerous than in others, such as clothing or shoemaking. Yet it may be said, in a general way, that you find Jews in all trades, in all professions.

It has been made a reproach to the Jews of America, as to those of London, that they have spread the sweating system. You all know what sweating means; it is the abuse of cheap labor, especially in work done at home, by the manufacturers or the middlemen who exploit the needs of their workingmen and give them starvation wages. It was hard that at the start, at least, the Jewish immigrants should be the prey of sweating. The evil is, however, greatly lessened at the present day. You will notice how different this reproach is from those made elsewhere against the Jews, when they are accused, as in France, of piling up fortunes. In America this reproach can no longer be made. There are, of course, some Jews who have attained wealth, even opulence. Despite that, if you take the great American millionaires or multi-millionaires, those who are ambitiously called the railroad kings, the gold kings, the oil kings, the steel kings, all those kings of industry who seem to reign over the great republic, you will not find among them a single Jew. The most

general grievance against the Jews is not that they accumulate wealth, although some merchants already complain of the high place in commerce they occupy. It is that they lower the average wage scale. This reproach is made against all emigrants from Europe, who above all wish to earn their bread. That European labor lowers wages seems erroneous, for nowhere in the world are wages higher. It would be more just to say that it is in great part to the emigrants from Europe that American industry owes its prodigious development, immigration being opposed to an undue raising of wages.

The Jewish societies in New York naturally occupy themselves with scattering the Jews who land in America throughout the various States. They are alarmed at the sight of so many thousands of Jews concentrated in the great metropolis. It is commonly said that there is "congestion," overcrowding in New York. It is sought to spread part of this population outside of the city. There are special societies for this purpose. Every year they succeeded in directing several thousand Jews to the interior. Unfortunately, the number who depart is always exceeded by the influx of newcomers from Europe. New York is not alone in having one or more ghettos. Philadelphia has hers. Almost all the large American cities similarly have their Jewish quarters. The difficulty is to influence the Jews to leave New York and the large cities. The mere fact that they prefer to remain in them is proof that they are pleased and prosper there. Then the immigrant Jews love to live among their own, to rub elbows with one another. They are suspicious of the isolation of the country or of small towns. In spite of that, it is probable that the tide of immigration will be successfully diverted to the whole of American and Canadian territory. Several methods have been thought of, even inducements to till the soil, agriculture or horticulture.

Once more the honor of the initiation belongs to the Alliance Israelite. It has opened several schools for teaching the Jews of Asia and Africa how to turn to agriculture. I have myself visited some of them; lately, indeed, that at Djedeida, near Tunis. Likewise in the United States the effort has been made to lead the Jews back to the soil. There are, for example, very successful

farms in New Jersey. Unfortunately, I did not have time to visit them. Far be it from me to discourage such initiative. However useful the foundation of such farming colonies may be, that cannot be the solution of the problem. Many things stand in the way. Even if ancient Israel was an agricultural people, the Jew has been cut off from the land for centuries. His whole history has carried him away from agriculture. The laws of Russia and Roumania still forbid the Jews to hold real estate. They even forbid the Jews to engage in farming. Then is it necessary to remind you of this—the city man everywhere finds it hard to return to the culture of the land? That is not a peculiarity of the Jew; that cannot be made a charge against him. It is a general fact; it may be said to be an historic law. If the Jews prefer the city they only yield, as do a very great number of our peasants who abandon the life of the fields, to the currents of our civilization and to the instincts of contemporaneous democracy. It must be noted, besides, as one of the reasons that prevent bringing back the majority of the Jews to the cultivation of the soil, that hereditary poverty and centuries of long sequestration in the ghetto have often taken from them the strength for the rude labor of the country.

Then the solution of the problem must be sought in another quarter, chiefly in the city trades. Now, with respect to this, it is evident that America offers an unlimited field. In the East, in Russia, in Asia and Africa, where agriculture remains the chief industry, it is comprehensible that true interest lies on the side of opening to the Jews the outlet of the soil. In America the question does not appear the same way. In the United States, in spite of the prosperity of agriculture, it is in industry, in the trades of the city, that the Jew must chiefly seek the means of existence. Your American coreligionists understand that. They have taken pains to establish technical and professional schools of all sorts.

After the material condition of the Jews in New York, I should like briefly to examine their intellectual and moral condition. The inhabitants of the ghetto form communities divided into distinct groups, often even isolated from one another. This is not so much the effect of what is called their clannish spirit as of the diversity of the countries from which they come. There

are some from almost every country of Europe. Then even if you take the Russian Jews, they are not all from the same region. They tend to unite according to the country of their origin, their national or religious affinities. It is explicable that the ghetto includes different societies; that each group has its synagogues, its associations, its clubs.

Few New York Jews deprive themselves of the pleasure of being members of one or more societies. At night you may see in the clubs or libraries men who have worked all day spend the evening bent over their books or discussing political, social, religious or literary questions. Everywhere the observer is struck with the serious air of these meetings. In no country are the libraries more numerous, better equipped, more within everybody's reach than in the United States. In these libraries you meet Jews of every age and every nation—men, women, youths and girls. A librarian, not a Jew, remarked to me: "Most of our readers call for novels, some books of travel, a few instruction books. The case is not the same with the Jews. They chiefly demand works that may contribute to their intellectual development. Often a little Jew of 15 or 16 years of age feels himself insulted if tales of adventure are suggested to him. He will prefer a scientific work or a book on political economy." For their intellectual development the Jews have profited largely by American liberality. The Americans recognize that the Jews are in general remarkably intelligent. I should not like here to attempt a sort of classification of the Jews of different origin. I may say, however, that those who are regarded as most gifted are precisely those against whom there was most prejudice, the Russian Jews. The Russians, they told me, are the Jews of the future. Their intelligence is attested by their success in the schools and even at the university. Columbia University in New York counts a large number of Jewish students. They are among the most studious there and their success already awakens jealousy.

Among these Jewish immigrants are naturally found various tendencies. Some keep the old traditional and conservative spirit of the old Jewries of the East. Others, on the contrary, particularly Russian Jews, former pupils of the Russian colleges or

universities, are ardent proselytes to the new ideas, and spread about them, to the point of rashness or temerity, modern aspirations and socialist doctrines. The Americans reproach these Russian Jews with their collectivist tendencies or even their anarchist desires, wrongly imputing to the Jewish spirit what is rather the effect of the Russian spirit and of the natural revolt provoked among the Czar's subjects by an arbitrary and oppressive régime that has lasted for ages. Most of the Jews, after they have at first been intoxicated by the air of liberty that they breathe in the United States, soon see that revolutionary tendencies and the Utopian spirit have little scope in America. Continuing to devote themselves enthusiastically to social problems, they become more sensible, more moderate, more practical, in proportion as they are impregnated with the American spirit.

The Jews of America are, in fact, gradually being Americanized. In this respect two opposite tendencies exist among them. Some, the more distrustful of novelty, more attached to traditional customs, seek to maintain in the American republic a separate Jewish life. The others, the largest number, the most intelligent or clear-sighted, have a different feeling. They maintain that the Jew who has established himself in America ought to become American.

How can this Americanization be effected, under what form, by what processes? It is effected first by the material surroundings and by the moral surroundings. The Jews do not live shut up in their ghettos; they clear the enclosure; they play their part in the intense American life; they undergo the influence of the ideas and sentiments of the population that surrounds them. Willy nilly they breathe the free tonic atmosphere of the great republic. Most take in the air with expanded lungs, glad to become new men as well as Americans.

There is another agent of Americanization—the school and the education of children. You are not ignorant of the importance of the school in the United States. It is of capital importance in a country of immigration. It is chiefly the school that Americanizes the young immigrants, and the rapidity with which it does its work is striking. Children who came to America at the age of three, four or five years already pass as Americans.

You must press them to make them say that they were not born in America. That seems a sort of inferiority to them. They are almost ashamed of it. I asked some little Jewish girls in a New York school: "Where were you born?" This question, which did not seem indiscreet to me, they answered timidly, blushing, saying that they had been born at Wilna or Odessa. Those great cities of Russia seemed so far off to them. They represented a somber barbarity from which they had emerged into the light.

At school the simplest means, the most practical and also the directest, the most loyal, are used to get the children to consider themselves as Americans and to be proud of being so. You know that in the United States, although the State attaches great importance to public instruction and spares nothing required for the schools, it affords full liberty of teaching in all grades. The Jews generally prefer to send their children to the public schools. They are not afraid to place them under teachers of the Christian religion. They think that in these schools the children will more quickly acquire the American spirit. Instruction at the public school is, moreover, respectful toward all religious faiths. National unity is not sought by way of moral unity or religious unity. It is sought in the attachment to a common fatherland, in the legitimate pride of belonging to a great nation. Patriotism, which certain Europeans regard as a superstition of the past, is more lively and stronger than ever in America. It is expressed in the school by the homage rendered the flag. In certain States, as New York, the star-spangled banner is made a veritable cult. The Jews willingly associate themselves with it, the more so as for them the American flag is the shining symbol of the rights they have recovered in America. The children in the schools are taught the names and lives of the men who made the Revolution and the republic. These ancestors of American liberty the little immigrants are accustomed to regard as their fathers by adoption. They are also taught the Constitution of the United States. The Declaration of Independence is even explained to them. I confess that in my eyes it seemed that this would be an example to follow. They are not content with making the children learn the Declaration of Independence by heart. It is explained to them article by article. I have seen little children, Jewish girls

about twelve years old, answer quite precisely their teacher's questions on this weighty subject. You felt in the answers that these children, of another soil and other blood, considered the heroes of American independence as their fathers in the spirit, if not in the flesh.

The Americanization of the Jews can be more easily brought about as there is a natural harmony between the Jewish and the American spirit. What is the American spirit? It consists, before all, in the love of liberty, equality, justice; it gives free play to all sorts of initiative, to all sorts of capacity; it is in everything a spirit of progress. Now, if you take the Jewish spirit in its noblest representatives, the great thinkers of Israel, the prophets of the Bible, you find among them equally the love of liberty, justice, fraternity among men and nations. This ideal is common to the Jews and the Americans. It is not surprising that the founders of the great republic, notably the Puritans of New England, borrowed in great part from the Hebrew Bible. More than that, an American, Mr. Oscar Straus, has shown that the Bible and the example of the twelve tribes of Israel had not been alien to the federal Constitution of the United States. This Constitution, so in harmony with the best traditions, this government which guarantees them all their rights, why should the American Jews not be attached to it? Such attachment is the easier to them as most of them could not feel much regret for the country of their origin, that Russia, that Roumania, which, in place of being a fatherland was to them, the Jews, only a stepmother.

Numerous private institutions, such as, to the honor of the United States, it is easy to found in the great republic, have the mission of working toward the Americanization of the Jewish immigrants as well as their intellectual and physical improvement. At the head of those institutions I must mention the Educational Alliance, in the heart of the ghetto, doing admirable work and occupying a vast building in the East Side, the six stories of which are open to all societies and instruction proper for the simultaneous development of the body and the intelligence.

The Jews of America are so Americanized already as to take active part in public American life. The Jews of New York, in

particular, being numerous, already constitute a force in a country where number is all-powerful. In the electoral struggles of the city and State they form an influential factor with which candidates and politicians must reckon. Thus a grave question is put these newcomers from Europe: Should the Jews of the United States group themselves into a national or religious party? Should there be a "Jewish vote," as, in certain States, there is an Irish or a German vote?

This question, which arises anew at each election, the Jews of America have habitually answered in the negative. The large majority remain of the opinion that they ought to guard against forming a distinct group, a peculiar group, based on confession. As for me, I can only congratulate them upon this. If, at certain moments, a Jewish party, a Jewish vote, throwing all its weight on one side was able to present some advantage, these advantages were less real than apparent. In any case, they were temporary, and the inconveniences that could spring therefrom would have been considerable and lasting. In every country the participation of Jews, as Jews, in party struggles has the effect of compromising them in the eyes of the opposing parties. It runs the risk of provoking or strengthening anti-Semitism. The great majority of the Jews of America understand that. In place of constituting themselves into a group, to make weight for the support of one of the parties in the campaign, they attach themselves freely, each individual according to his personal preferences, to the two great historical parties. In this they act as free American citizens, who vote according to their conscience. Thus, in New York, Boston, Cincinnati, I met Jews who were ardent Democrats. At the last presidential election, however, the great majority of the Jews seem to have voted for Roosevelt and the Republican party. That is one of the reasons for the unusual majority that President Roosevelt obtained in the city of New York and in the "Empire State." What is there to be surprised at in this, when you think of the services rendered by Roosevelt during his first administration to the persecuted Jews of the Orient and the great cause of religious liberty and equality?

Did not President Roosevelt have the courage to assume officially for the United States, in the note of his Secretary of

State, Mr. Hay, to the European cabinets, responsibility for the just demands of the Jews of Roumania, iniquitously deprived of the rights promised by the Berlin treaty, which they have not yet brought successfully before the signatory powers? And, later, at the time of the massacres of Kischineff, which went almost entirely unpunished, did not President Roosevelt consent officially to transmit to the Russian government the protests raised from one end of the great republic to the other, by the horror of these barbaric scenes, and, more still, perhaps, by the cowardice or complicity of certain agents of the imperial government? Finally, the Jews could not forget that, in a question that touches at once their honor and their interests, the endorsement of passports to Russia, in connection with the right of visiting the Czar's empire, denied to American Jews, Mr. Roosevelt had energetically defended their cause, and had not wearied of demanding equality of treatment for all American citizens.

In this triple set of circumstances—Roumanian affairs and Kischineff massacres and Russian passports—the Jews obtained, thanks to Mr. Roosevelt, the aid of the government and of the diplomacy of the United States. But is this anything to astonish or scandalize you, since in thus sustaining the rights of the Jews the President of the great republic was only defending the rights of humanity and religious liberty? It is true that, however powerful the voice of the United States, the efforts of President Roosevelt in favor of the objects of persécution in Russia or Roumania seem so far to have remained futile. Perhaps they have not been entirely so. Perhaps the example or the lessons given by him will not have been useless. In any case, whatever may have been the outcome, nobody could say that in taking this noble initiative and in having the courage thus to make himself the organ of contemporaneous conscience, the great republic or its first magistrate has made himself appear small in the eyes of the peoples.

The real sufferer from the refusals to President Roosevelt are Russia and the Russian government, made responsible by American opinion for the oppression of the Jews and for the exodus to distant places, to which unjust rigors force so many unfortunate victims. The predilection for the Japanese, strongly

manifested by the Americans since the opening of the war in Manchuria, is not explained only by commercial preoccupation. The chief reason for it is the natural antipathy roused in a free people by the violences of a government that refuses to so many of its subjects the rights indispensable to human life and dignity. The tales of the proceedings of Russian despotism, told not only by the Jews driven from Russia by exceptional laws, but also by the Polish immigrants, the Finns, the Armenians, even the Russians, all victims of a régime of unjust repression, are not apt to win for the autocratic empire the friendship of a liberal and tolerant nation. In this sense one might say that if any one is responsible for the partiality of the Americans for the Japanese and the unpopularity of Russia in the United States, it is the Russian government. Let it get to the point of renouncing its superannuated laws, let it at last dare to show itself tolerant, let it grant to all its subjects, without distinction of origin or religion, liberty of conscience, with the guarantees necessary to the modern man, and, as I said to you just now, Russia can recover American sympathy with that of the whole civilized world.

The Jews of America, especially the Jews who have come from Russia, would be the first to rejoice in this transformation of the Empire of the Czars. Although exchanging Russian servitude for American liberty seems to them like passing from the yoke of the Pharaohs of Egypt to the security of another promised land, they do not lose their interest in their old Slavic fatherland; they do not forget the brothers and friends they left there a prey to a régime of persecution. With these brothers, these relatives remaining in captivity, the enfranchised Jews of America often keep up relations. They frequently send them help, as the banks of New York testify. Not being able to have all come to American soil, they pray for their speedy deliverance. Hence the development of "Zionism" in the United States.

This Zionism the immigrants have often brought from the ghettos of Russia, Roumania, Galicia. A thing that is at first sight surprising is the number of these men who seem to have sought the promised land beyond the Atlantic, continuing to dream of the mountains of Judea and the banks of the Jordan. If they have not been permitted to establish themselves there, they

hope that their brothers left in the Old World will some day be able to settle there and prepare a refuge, an assured asylum for all the persecuted of Israel. This thought, which I do not wish to discuss here, seems to me to make the strength of American Zionism and to be its justification. Like shipwrecked mariners saved from the tempest, who have companions still at the mercy of the waves, the Jews of America, not content with seeing themselves in security, think of their brothers and ardently desire to procure their salvation. To many of the immigrants, notably to the simplest or most enthusiastic, Zionism, the formation of a Jewish State, still seems the best way to salvation, the only means, perhaps, of escaping forever the persecution of anti-Semitism, of at last putting a term to the repeated wanderings of Israel. That is why Zionist societies are so numerous in America, why so many Jews of every origin are affiliated with them, why, even among the poorest, so many immigrants conscientiously turn in the *shekel* demanded by the Basle congress.

Whatever opinion one may have of Zionist aspirations, is not such a sentiment respectable? Moreover, there are in the United States, more perhaps than elsewhere, different sorts of Zionism. It might be said that the Zionism of most of the Americans is Platonic. Very few of them think of leaving their new American country for the ancient land of the patriarchs. More than one of those I interrogated on this subject made a response similar to those I have so many times received in other countries: "If ever a Jewish State should again be formed in Palestine, I shall ask to be the consul of the new Zion to New York or Chicago."

Whether it is inconsequential or not, the partisans even of political Zionism do not regard themselves any the less as good Americans. Such an assumption is less singular in America than it would be in Europe. In the United States, where live so many men differing in origin, some are frequently found who have a sort of double patriotism. While devoted to their new country, they do not think themselves lacking in loyalty toward her if they keep a natural attachment to the old country, the land of their fathers. That is frequent among the Germans and still more so among the Irish-Americans. The Jew who has become an Ameri-

can citizen, but professes to keep up a Jewish and Zionist patriotism, is therefore not to be distinguished so much as might be feared from his new Christian compatriots. Zionism, even if it is political, does not seem to him irreconcilable with Americanization and loyalty towards the great republic. Zionism, moreover, is the dream; Americanization is the reality. Whether they are conscious of it or not, the country of Washington is the country of the future as well as of the present for the persecuted who came to it for refuge.

The Jews, and with them Judaism, are called to new destinies in this new land. What will these destinies be? A great and obscure problem, which the choice spirits among American Jews regard some with anxiety, most with confidence.

I was often undeservedly honored in the United States with questions on this matter: What, according to you, I was asked, should be the attitude of the Jews in America? Are you a defender of assimilation? What, do you think, will be the future of American Judaism? Has it a mission, and what is that mission? If it becomes resigned to assimilation, will it not end by being submerged and by finally disappearing?

In other countries, too, I have been asked these big, delicate questions on the future of the Jews and the rôle of Judaism. However embarrassing they might be, I did not wish to decline to answer them. In the United States, as elsewhere, I have answered them loyally, according to my opinion, as a modern man and according to the teachings that it seems to me history has given.

Should the Jews accept assimilation? Yes, in America as in Europe they should assimilate themselves with the people among whom they live and who recognize their rights as citizens. They ought to be Americans in the United States as they are Frenchmen in France and Englishmen in England. They should drop particularist prejudices; adapt themselves to modern life and customs. But assimilation does not mean absorption; still less disappearance. The Jew of the United States can become a true and good American while remaining a good and true Jew. To be a useful citizen of the great republic it is not necessary for him to renounce his faith and what is noblest in his traditions.

On the contrary, he must remain faithful to his God and to his Bible.

And to those who asked me what was the mission of American Judaism, how it would endure on the new Continent, and if, after having resisted so many persecutions, the Jew would not let himself be encroached upon and dissolved by the very liberty of America, I gave a similar answer. Judaism can perpetuate itself only in the manner in which it has existed for twenty centuries; that is to say, under the form of a religion. In America, no less than in Europe, if the Jews do not wish to be scattered and to disappear among the nations, they have only to remain attached to their worship and their faith.

Otherwise, whatever success in two worlds, their intelligence, their talents, their energy can avail them, they will perish with the religion which alone has preserved their individuality through the ages. The existence, the continuance, of the Jews remains today, as formerly, bound up with the continuance and the life of Judaism.

And if Judaism itself keeps a mission, this mission, it seems to me, is that which has been handed down by its books and its prophets. It is, above all, a religious and moral mission. It is to maintain the idea of God in the face of growing materialism and neopaganism. It is to guard and spread the double notion of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood, grand ideas common to Judaism and to Christianity, which the latter, it must be said, has received from the former. To be inspired by the prophets and messianic aspirations, to work, with the aid of God, for the reign of Justice and Peace among men and among nations, is a task that can suffice the ambition of the Jews of two worlds, and for this great work, in America as in Europe, the sons of Israel can count on the collaboration of the best of their Christian fellow-citizens.

THE JEWS AS ELEMENTS IN THE POPULATION, PAST AND PRESENT *

BY LOUIS MARSHALL

It has long been a popular fallacy, that the Jew has been a latecomer on American soil; that he has been unwilling to undergo the hardships of the pioneer, or to create new paths for industry and commerce; that his admittance within our gates has been a matter of grace and bounty, and that his rights are inferior in antiquity to those of our population, who have other racial and religious affinities. But when we remember that the settlement at Jamestown, Virginia, was in 1607, that of the Dutch at New Amsterdam in 1614, that of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and that of the first settlement of the Jews in New York occurred in 1655, the latter are to be regarded as of equal rank with the most ancient American settlers.

They are thus the contemporaries of the proud Virginian, of the revered Puritan, and of the substantial Knickerbocker. They preceded the Irish, the German, the Scandinavian, the Hun, the Slav, and the Italian. Their traditions run back to the earliest days of our country's history, and their lineage is traced in unbroken line through all the centuries, through all nations of the earth, to the hills and plains of Palestine.

Nor were the first Jewish settlers who landed in New York newcomers on this continent. They had previously embarked in commercial enterprises, and founded their homes, in Brazil, under the protection of the Dutch Republic, at a period almost contemporaneous with the discovery of the noble stream, which bears the name of the daring navigator who first beheld it, at

* Address delivered April 29, 1905, at a Judean meeting in celebration of the 250th anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States.

whose confluence with the world's highway, stands this mighty metropolis.

Nor were even they, the first of Jewish blood to behold this continent. For there were Jews who accompanied Columbus on his first voyage into the vast immensity of the unknown sea.

They are thus, in the strictest sense of the term, to be classed as American pioneers; not as interlopers, not as exploiters, but as active participants in the upbuilding of the nation.

Their advent into this community was not that of suppliants, or of those coming by sufferance. They had united their fortunes with those of their adopted country—Holland—when they settled under its flag in Brazil; and when the Dutch surrendered to the Portuguese they sought as a right, and not as a privilege, a new home under that same flag. Their rights were recognized by the Dutch West India Company, which, formed as it was in part by Jewish enterprise, had established the colony. They were upheld even against the protests of the intolerant and irascible Stuyvesant, into whose keeping had been placed the fortunes of the New Netherlands. Hearken to these words, uttered six months before Manasseh ben Israel stood before Cromwell to demand the readmission of the Jews into England, whence they had been excluded for three centuries:

"It would be unreasonable and unfair, especially because of the considerable loss sustained by the Jews in taking Brazil, and also because of the large amount of capital which they have invested in shares of this company to exclude them. After many consultations we have decided and resolved upon a certain petition made by said Portuguese Jews, that they shall have permission to sail and trade in New Netherlands and to live and remain there, provided the poor among them shall not become a burden to the company or to the community, but be supported by their own nation."

Such are the memorable terms of the instructions to the reluctant Stuyvesant, from the directors of the company, which bear date, April 26, 1655, and which may well be called the charter of Jewish liberties in America.

Not only were these early settlers fortified by this grant, based on moral and legal considerations, but by their manhood,

their independence, their self-respect and readiness to assert and maintain their rights, they acquired for themselves equal rights of citizenship, although to accomplish that result it was necessary for them to enter into a conflict with hostile and prejudiced official administrators, who sought in every way to curtail their rights.

Thus, they successively demanded and acquired the right to own real property; to carry on their commercial enterprises throughout the colony, from Fort Orange to the Delaware; to exercise their religion within their houses; and finally, in 1657, Asser Levy and Jacob Barsimson, men of Maccabæan mould, of the same high type of character as that which is admired in the Pilgrim fathers, men of strong moral fibre, not flabby of soul, or cringing and fawning in spirit, petitioned to be allowed to stand guard, like the other burghers, or, if that right were refused, to be relieved from the tax imposed upon their people because of their exemption from military service, which they neither requested nor desired. To attain this right, they were in every instance compelled to appeal to the authorities in Holland. But they prevailed, and Asser Levy—*nomen venerabile*—became the first Jewish citizen within the territory now occupied by the United States.

This is not the occasion for a protracted history of Jewish immigration. Settlers found their way from New York to Rhode Island, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the more southern colonies. Their numbers increased slowly, but their loyalty to the communities in which they lived was unflagging and unswerving. They engaged in commerce extensively. They ranked high as merchants. They contributed to the development of new industries. They entered into trade relations with foreign countries, and with the sparse settlements of the western country.

During the revolutionary period, with few exceptions they united their fortunes with those of the infant republic. They fought in the Continental Army. Men like Haym Solomon helped to replenish the empty treasury, and made every sacrifice that patriotism could offer for the cause of country and of home. And when the war was at an end, and the new government was formed, Washington recognized their fidelity, and assured them

that "all possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship."

Indeed, they were not interlopers, or newcomers. John Jacob Astor, the founder of the princely family which to-day stands at the head of New York society, was employed at a dollar a day in 1786, to beat furs, by Hayman Levy; and this constitutes no blot on the family escutcheon. It merely serves to show that in point of antiquity, respectability and good citizenship, we can vie with the most ancient of American aristocracy.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Jews of America were principally of Portuguese, Spanish and Dutch descent. Some Jews had come from Poland and Germany, but the principal influx of German and Polish Jews did not occur until after the Napoleonic wars. Those who came were, as a rule, young or middle aged, limited in means, strong of heart, courageous and ambitious, persevering, industrious; men and women endowed with high moral principle and deep religious convictions. They came with the desire to build homes in the new land; to give of their strength to their new country; to shrink from no sacrifice which would tend to demonstrate that they could maintain their Judaism, and at the same time rank among the most American of the Americans.

There is not a field in the entire range of commerce and of professional life, which they and their descendants have not occupied and developed. Every branch of manufacture has been stimulated and improved by them. They have penetrated into the depths of the mountains with their mines, and their products float on every sea. They have contributed to the building of cities in every State. Their offspring reflect honor on every school, and on every department of intellectual endeavor. During the Civil War they shed their blood for the preservation of the Union. Their hearts, their hands, and their fortunes have become inseparably united with those of the city, the state, and the nation which they call their own. Their loyalty has never been questioned, and their pride in American institutions is immeasurable in its intensity, because those institutions are the only political ones that they have been enabled under constitutional guarantees to call their own, since the days of the dispersion.

In 1880 the number of Jews in the city of New York did not exceed 100,000. Since then, owing to the unspeakable horrors of Russian and Roumanian oppression, and of the dire poverty in Galicia, the tide of Jewish immigration has increased in volume year after year, until to-day the Jewish population of New York City amounts to well-nigh 750,000, and that of the United States to upwards of 1,250,000, and the numbers are constantly increasing.

Many of these new arrivals have not as yet attained the highest standard of citizenship, are still struggling with poverty and misery, are yet unacquainted with our vernacular, and have brought with them unfamiliar customs, strange tongues, and ideas, which are the product of centuries of unexampled persecution.

But what of that! They have come to this country with the pious purpose of making it their home; of identifying themselves and their children with its future; of worshipping under its protection, according to their consciences; of becoming its citizens; of loving it; of giving to it their energies, their intelligence, their persistent industry.

The Pilgrim fathers did no more than this. The progenitors of the leading families of this country were not otherwise. The lineage of the Russian Jew runs back much further than theirs. He is the descendant of men who were renowned for learning and for intellectual achievements, when from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, from Sandy Hook to the Golden Gate, this was a howling wilderness.

The Russian Jew is rapidly becoming the American Jew, and we shall live to see the time when the present dwellers in the tenements will, through their thrift and innate moral powers, hitherto repressed and benumbed, step into the very forefront of the great army of American citizenship.

When the first Jewish settlers landed in the village of New Amsterdam, they were also poor, wretched and miserable. Their goods were insufficient for their passage money. Each had stood as surety for the other, and each stood prepared to stand as a hostage, one for the other. Like the famous Musqueteers, their motto was: "One for all, and all for one."

This is a wholesome thought for the Jews of the present

generation. It is well that we commemorate not only the fact of settlement, but also the conditions and circumstances which surrounded the pioneers. If they in their misery did not shrink from the responsibility of brotherhood, we would be contemptible beyond expression, if, in our prosperity, we should shrink from a like sacrifice. The proudest title of distinction that the Jews of New York have thus far achieved, lies in the fact that they have hitherto sacredly observed and strictly performed the condition imposed upon them two hundred and fifty years ago, in the charter of their liberties, of seeing to it that "the poor among them should not become a burden to the community, but should be supported by their own nation."

Although the Dutch West India Company, which imposed that obligation, has long since disappeared; though the flag of Holland has been lowered before the flag of Great Britain, and the flag of that powerful nation has been dimmed by the glory of the stars and stripes, the moral obligation accepted by the first Jewish settlers, and which has been assumed as a charge by each succeeding generation, remains in as full force and virtue to-day, as it did in the dawn of our American life, sanctioned by the undeniable behests of religion and humanity, and hallowed by blessed memories.

THE JEW AS A CITIZEN *

BY PROF. MORRIS LOEB

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The President, although all-knowing in this society, has made one little slip. He says five of the speakers are members of the bar. I am a chemist, engaged in the mixing of fluids, which is supposed to be one of the functions of the bar as well, so I belong to that fraternity also. However, that has nothing to do with my subject. I take as a text for what I hope is my brief address a passage from a letter which is printed in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, the letter written by George Washington in 1790 in answer to an address by the Jews of Newport, R. I.

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercises of their inherent natural rights. For happily the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effective support."

As it seems to me, when the committee assigned to me the topic, "The Jew as a Citizen," there was a doubt in their mind whether, even at the present day, the idea expressed by him whom we call the Father of his Country was fully carried out; tolerance is still more spoken of than demonstrated. I for one do not think it quite fair that we should have to discuss at all the

* Address delivered April 29, 1915, at a Judean meeting in celebration of the 250th anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States.

question of the Jew as a citizen. There is an underlying feeling as if a defense of the Jew as a citizen need be undertaken. I am reminded of a story they tell of an Irishman at the time when a wave of know-nothingism was sweeping over the city; he said, "They object to foreigners, do they? Who builds their streets or their railroads, but the foreigners? Who digs their ditches, but the foreigners? Who furnishes their police for them but the foreigners, and who governs them but the foreigners? And begorra, who discovered their country but the foreigners?" I was delighted to hear the assertion repeated by Mr. Marshall that some of our coreligionists were among the foreigners who discovered the country, having sailed with Columbus on his quest of the West, and we know that the Jews have at all times since the founding of the early colonies formed a percentage of those who constituted their membership; that percentage has certainly grown very largely over the small band that came here 250 years ago, but at all times there was a percentage.

Now I would not have accepted the duty of addressing you to-night upon the subject, if I had felt called upon to rehearse the individual proofs of good citizenship by American Jews, or Jews who have settled in this country. I feel that this is a topic which has been pretty well put before us at other occasions by another society. I have never yet been able, personally, to see the great advantage of proving that in some particular affair one particular man happened to be a Jew; because it is my belief that the Jews are men, above everything else, and if they happen to perform acts of good citizenship, they perform them, not because they are Jews, nor in spite of the fact that they are Jews, but because Judaism is a matter outside of the general question of good citizenship. Nevertheless I admit that there is a pardonable pride which makes it of interest to us to see that in early times, as well as in the more modern era, whenever some momentous occurrence in American history, or the history of the world for that matter, took place, Jews were more or less connected with it, and generally on the honorable side. In this respect it is a pleasure to note that at all times, in every period of great national excitement, which called for volunteers for the service and defence of the country, there responded a larger quota, possibly, in

accordance with the percentage of population, from among the Jews than from any other particular sect. But when it is a question of citizenship *per se*, it seems to me that we ought, above everything else, to emphasize the fact that there is nothing in Jewish life or thought which claims specially a Jewish citizenship for the country where we are. It is of course a question on the part of others, perhaps—what do Jews bring as citizens, of what advantage are they? But the Jews themselves need not ask whether or not they are good citizens. They are perfectly well aware that the entire tendency of Judaism—what I would call its fundamental notion of citizenship—is expressed in the idea that it is not the individual that counts in citizenship, that there is a general good, for which the individual should, as much as possible, sink his own identity. It is for this reason again that I find rather a sign of praise, than the opposite, in the history of American Jews, and, for that matter the world over, in the circumstance that the percentage of those who have attained prominence as politicians, as military men, as rulers and leaders, is relatively small. You may think there is a certain amount of paradox in what I have said here, but I really believe it is a fact that the Jewish citizen who does his duty, as we know that he does it, is looking forward to less reward than any other citizen of any other faith or of any other origin, because the natural prejudice, which has existed for so many centuries and which even the progressive and liberal-spirited modern world has not swept away, makes us all realize that, however much we do, or attempt to do, we shall always fail to receive quite that amount of reward which we would, if the spirit of prejudice, the spirit of contempt, were not abroad in this country. Feeling, therefore, that our rewards cannot be so intimately personal as those that could come to others, it seems to me we have a right to claim for the Jews of New York, as well as the Jews of America in general, that what they have done, in the way of furthering our country's interest, whether by the actual sacrifice of their fortunes or their lives, during its period of trial, whether by their active support of movements that tend toward better citizenship, whether by their devotion to the various reforms which will further individual greatness by methods of education, they have always done

it with less of a feeling of ultimate reward for themselves; consequently their deeds have been prompted by those high motives that lead a man to such sacrifice to his nation. I am glad that the motto, "Where comfort is, there is my fatherland," was written in Latin and not in Hebrew. It is probably true that the Jews have, from time to time when leaving their own land, sought that land where their fortunes were aptest to lead a happy culmination, but at the same time, we Jews know that at all times, no matter what the condition, Jews were not the last to desert a losing cause. We have just as much right to be proud of a Judah P. Benjamin in the Confederacy, as we have a right to be of the share contributed by us to the victories of the North. When France was in direct need, Jews like Cremieux were her rehabilitators, and even at the present time, when Russians are deserting their own country, we know how in this city our own race from that land are feeling more for that country which gave them birth, and then drove them forth, than for the land whose victories are expected to diminish oppression. At all times, therefore, I believe the Jews have formed an integral part of the citizenship of their country. I would deprecate those ideas which would try to form a Jewish political community in the state, whether with the idea of building a state of the Jews by themselves, or whether even it be the idea that by reason of the fact that we are so many, we have a right to a sectarian representation, a proportionate amount of offices. Let us be satisfied with doing our duty as individual citizens, with supporting whatever is to be promoted for the right and for the good of our own country, for its own sake and not for whatever merit may accrue to us, or even to the race to which I am glad we belong.

THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN AND THE JEW *

BY GEORGE S. HELLMAN

By one of those strange ironies of fate which have often marked the history of the Jews, the year of greatest triumph for the most conspicuous modern representative of our race immediately preceded the initial years of the last three decades of Jewish oppression and degradation in the East. In 1878 Benjamin Disraeli held the fate of Europe in the palm of his withered hand; a year or two later, the mediæval cry of persecution rose anew in Russia, thence to reverberate with all the accents of barbarism throughout Roumania, Bulgaria and Servia.

What the Jew did for the Congress of Berlin, what the Congress of Berlin did for the Jew, and what manner of Jew was Benjamin Disraeli—these are the considerations arising from that famous convention which may well be allowed to make special appeal to our interest. Very briefly stated, the Eastern conditions that preceded the Congress were these: In the summer of 1875 the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina began their revolt against the Turkish Government. The spirit of insurrection, soon full-winged, hovered ominously over the other Turkish provinces. By the end of the year the Western powers, fearing especially lest an outbreak in Servia and Montenegro should precipitate a general conflict into which they themselves might ultimately be drawn, had addressed to the Ottoman Government the Andrassy Note, named after the Austrian Minister who had drafted it. The document sounded the note of insistence on the necessity of Turkish fulfillment of previous promises of reform, and enunciated the resolution of the signatories to compel the Sultan to end the wrongs committed against his Christian sub-

* An address delivered before the Jews, January 3, 1909.

jects. The terms of this note were accepted politely in words, and neglected, equally politely, in acts. Whereupon the Russian, German and Austrian ministers drew up what is known as the Berlin Memorandum, proposing the cessation of war between Turkey and her insurrectionary provinces, pending an agreement of the Western powers concerning the affairs in the East. But England, suspicious of some Russian design, refused to sign this memorandum, which then was never sent. Matters grew steadily worse, and before long an uprising in Bulgaria was crushed by the Turkish Government in so hideous a fashion that the Bulgarian atrocities still remain synonymous with what is most cruel in the annals of massacres. But even these bloody acts of the Turkish soldiers could not make Disraeli swerve from his theory that Turkey must be preserved to oppose the growth of Russia. For Gladstone, Turkish *misrule*, in actuality, was a thing to be loathed from the point of view of all mankind; for Disraeli, Turkish *rule*, in theory, was a thing to be desired from the point of view of Imperial England. Throughout Disraeli's political life, as Lecky points out in his great essay on the British Empire, "the note of Imperialism was perhaps that which sounded with the clearest ring."

June, 1876, saw the revolt of Servia and Montenegro. This was followed, in November, by a conference at Constantinople of all the great European powers. But Turkey, perhaps counting on the ultimate support of England, would not come to terms. And so, in April, 1877, the inevitable took place, and Russia declared war against Turkey.

The interesting strategic events of this conflict hardly admit of rehearsal here. The outcome alone must suffice; and this was the complete prostration of Turkey by the Russian army, with Constantinople a defenceless prize before the approaching forces. At this juncture the English Government, under the leadership of its Prime Minister Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, took those decisive steps which came so near to forcing the issue of war between Great Britain and Russia. The Mediterranean fleet was ordered to Constantinople. Excitement in both countries was at high pitch, but immediate hostilities were averted by the agreement between the two governments that the Russian soldiers

should not advance nearer the Turkish capital and that the English troops should not disembark. Many historians believe that the violation of this agreement would have been the signal for war. Meanwhile the arts of diplomacy still remained available.

Russia's attempt to secure the fruits of her victory over Turkey found expression in the Treaty of San Stefano, in which the Ottoman Government assented to the practical independence of its Christian provinces, and allowed, at the same time, the formation of an extensive Bulgarian state, reaching to the Ægean Sea. By these terms, as Disraeli immediately declared, Russian influence would become paramount over the entire Southeastern Europe, and many of the conditions, established by the Treaty of Paris, would become upset. England unequivocally refused to recognize the San Stefano document, and insisted that all the provisions of the treaty between Russia and Turkey should be submitted to the consideration of a European congress. When Disraeli ordered some of the troops of the Indian Government to Malta it seemed more and more as if Russia must choose at once the field of arms or the field of debate.

Upon this dramatic scene now steps forth Prince Bismarck. The Iron Chancellor assumes the rôle of mediator of peace, and invites the European powers to meet at Berlin, there to discuss all the questions involved in the treaty of San Stefano.

The Congress of Berlin! I wonder whether our scholarly guest, Signor Ferrero, can summon forth from his great store of historical knowledge another such scene, so distinguished in its individual participants, so representative of the ambitions and aspirations of nations, and, above all, so satirically symbolical of human life! Beneath the general flow of discussion, cross-currents of selfish national purpose ran at scarcely hidden depths. Bismarck, the peace mediator, saw the advantages, not of war, but of protracted enmity between Russia and England. Andrassy for Austria, was intent on the acquisition of new territory for his empire—this with the approval of Bismarck. Gortschakoff strove to retain the advantages seemingly offered to Russia at San Stefano. France and Italy had their Mediterranean interests to consider. The Turkish ambassadors were piteously begging to escape the consequences of the recent war, and the minor powers,

Greece, Roumania, Servia, etc., who had no active part in the Congress, rehearsed their various grievances and desires in the hope of winning a small pittance from the master hands. And England—her purpose was, as before, to prevent the entire disintegration of the Turkish Empire, and to oppose such concessions to Russia as might in the future be a source of danger to the development of the British Empire.

The Congress began its sessions on the 13th day of June, 1878. A fortnight earlier, Disraeli and his Foreign Minister, Lord Salisbury, made a secret arrangement both with Russia and with Turkey, by which Russia was to have Bessarabia and Batoum, while Turkey was to give the island of Cyprus to England, in return for the English guarantee of protection of Turkey's Asiatic possessions. When these arrangements became known, Disraeli was criticised both for their terms and for the hypocritical element which they injected into the actions at the Congress of the already committed British plenipotentiaries. But it probably remains true that it was this secret agreement with Russia that made possible the Congress of Berlin. Nor, while infusing a certain element of farce (all the more so as the Turkish ambassadors did not know of their own government's secret agreement), can it fairly be said that these preliminary arrangements rendered the deliberations of the Congress superficial and empty. Disraeli and Bismarck had averted European war in bringing the powers together, but even so, many a time the shades of conflict gathered at the angry clash of opposing wills. M. Gabriel Hanotaux, fortunate in recently obtaining unpublished papers of one of the Turkish ministers at the Congress, has very interestingly presented enlightening details of its proceedings. There were times when Disraeli threatened, and not in simulated earnest; times when Gortschakoff left the hall; times when Bismarck abruptly commanded. Disraeli's influence was most potent with the Turkish plenipotentiaries, and on one occasion, as Pasha Caratheodory relates in his memoirs, "Lord Beaconsfield did not content himself with giving advice" to the recalcitrant ambassadors. "He openly threatened. He accused the Ottoman plenipotentiaries of upsetting the projects of England, of placing her in a position where she could no longer

defend Turkey against either the principalities or Greece." It is interesting to reflect that in order to make such a statement with force Disraeli must have felt absolute confidence that, whether for war or peace, as he decided, England would act. And such, indeed, was the case.

Quite apart from his power as the representative of Great Britain, Disraeli exercised a potent personal influence over his colleagues. Sir Wm. Fraser relates that Lord Ampthill, then British Ambassador at Berlin, assured him that "every one of the distinguished men who met there had formed and expressed to him the highest opinion of Disraeli's powers. In addition to their admiration of his intellect, they were much struck by the calmness of thought and the indications of depth of mind which he showed. Some time after the conference, when a man of high rank paid a visit to Prince Bismarck, the latter pointed to the wall on which there were but three pictures suspended. He said: "One is a portrait of my wife; one of the Emperor, my sovereign; the third of Lord Beaconsfield."

This anecdote is of significance in indicating the attitude toward Disraeli of the German statesman who was the guiding factor at the Congress of Berlin. A more amusing anecdote along the same lines Disraeli himself delighted to narrate. It seems that when his first interview with Bismarck took place, the Chancellor's great dog, his constant companion, ran to meet Disraeli with demonstrations of affection. This was particularly gratifying to Disraeli, for the dog had tried to bite Prince Gortschakoff when the Russian Ambassador called on Bismarck.

While Disraeli's influence behind the scenes was, from many indications, of much weight throughout the sessions of the Congress, it was openly exerted with deepest personal interest in connection with those clauses in the Treaty of Berlin which were intended to grant civic rights and liberty to the Jews in Roumania, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Servia.

It was on June 28, 1878, that M. Waddington, the French plenipotentiary, proposed that the Congress should determine to grant civic freedom to the Jews in Servia. Gortschakoff protested against such action, but Bismarck for Germany and de Launay for Italy seconded the resolution of France, which was

then adopted. On July 1st, Waddington brought forward similar resolutions in respect to Roumania, and Disraeli for England rose to second them. The Treaty of Berlin in its final shape included articles identical in form, determining that religious convictions should form no bar to any civic position in Bulgaria and Montenegro, as well as in Servia and Roumania.

While thus it was France that introduced the liberal resolutions which resulted in these clauses, the seconding voice of England's Jewish Prime Minister was one that could inconceivably have been disregarded by his colleagues. Viewed in the light of subsequent events, how easily we might be led to consider this a barren victory for the Jews! Roumania, in all these intervening thirty years, has allowed the rights of citizenship to so small a number of her Jewish sons that a room like this of ours would more than suffice to contain them. But no edifice built by mortal hand could hold the vast multitude of Roumanian Jews that have suffered the excesses of oppression since the Congress of Berlin sought to provide for their liberation. With cruel ingenuity the seventh clause of the Roumanian Constitution was so worded as practically to make the restrictions therein embodied a weapon whereby to disqualify the Jews from naturalization and property rights. The acceptance by the European powers in 1880 of this clause as a substitute for the liberal article in the Treaty of Berlin is a blot on the escutcheon of European diplomacy. When we recall that of the countries liberated by the Congress of Berlin, Roumania alone contained a very large Jewish population, small comfort can be gained from the fact that Bulgaria and Servia have shown themselves less barbarous.

Actually, then, in the realm of demonstrable facts the burden of Jewish oppression was not much lightened by the Congress of Berlin. Such benefit as there accrued to our race was of a nature that admits rather of speculation than of proof—positive benefit, no doubt, but indeterminate both as to extent and result. In the first place, the mere fact that the Jewish question had been so considered by an international conference, that the actions of Eastern countries toward their Jewish inhabitants had been made the business for discussion by the great powers—this, in itself, served to establish a precedent of much hope for the Jews.

More than one protest against anti-Semitic persecution bears historical reference to the action of the Congress; and, as we are proud to know, America in especial has not hesitated—as in the famous note of Secretary Hay—to let her voice be thus heard in the cause of civilization.

The second element of benefit to the Jews is even more intangible, but, to my mind at least, of more inspiring potentiality. Without going in detail into the results of the Congress, without scrutinizing subsequent developments in the history of Turkey and of Russia, it may be stated without fear of contradiction that in those critical days in the history of Europe, it was a Jew who, in vindicating the name and emphasizing the influence of England, thwarted the schemes of Russian aggrandizement, and, exercising the methods of peace at the same time that he was preparing for war, succeeded in averting what might easily have become a general European conflict. In his speech of July 18, 1879, in the House of Lords, Disraeli indicated the results of the Congress. He showed how by the overthrow of the Treaty of San Stefano the Treaty of Berlin had restored to Turkey thirty thousand square miles and two and a half millions of population which had otherwise fallen under Russian influence or dominion. He explained the wisdom of Austrian occupation of some of the Turkish provinces. He made evident the comparative insignificance of the concession of Batoum to Russia. He emphasized the advantage to England of the island of Cyprus, gained through his agreement with Turkey. He established his right to the claim that he had brought back from the Congress of Berlin the glorious gift of "Peace with Honor." No other modern statesman has ever acquitted himself more successfully of such grave responsibilities. That a Jew did this, not alone elevates the conception of the power of our race in the minds of others, but assuredly and justifiably must inspire in us feelings of pride that shall in their time lead to further accomplishment.

Disraeli returned to England the most powerful individual in Great Britain, and if we except Bismarck, the most distinguished statesman of Europe. When he spoke his few but memorable words to the welcoming and wildly enthusiastic crowd standing beneath his window in London, every voice that cheered

him vibrated with gratitude toward England's hero. We wonder whether Disraeli recalled the scene during his canvass at the Taunton Election exactly fifty years earlier, when, too, he had addressed a multitude from his window. Then he was interrupted continually with contemptuous cries of "A Jew! A Jew!" The calm reply of this baptized Christian was characteristic. "You accuse me of being a Jew. I am proud of it. I am of the House of Israel and I glorify in my descent!"

As the conclusion of the Congress of Berlin displays Disraeli at the zenith of his power and fame, there is no more interesting period of his life from which to survey his character and career; but the limits of this address are such that what is not more particularly of Jewish interest can be touched on only very cursorily, if at all.

Two facts, of which one alone has been sufficiently dwelt upon by biographers of Disraeli, stand forth, it seems, pre-eminently in all he did and in all he wrote: He was a Jew, more than he was an Englishman, and he was Disraeli more than he was a Jew. "The truth is, progress and reaction are but words to mystify the millions," he said in his biography of Lord George Bentinck. "They mean nothing, they are nothing; they are phrases and are not facts. All is race. In the structure, the decay and the development of the various families of man, the vicissitudes of history find their main solution." The race which Disraeli was never tired of praising was the Hebrew race. The saving element in all that seemed of worth in human institutions he looked upon either as a result or as a direct expression of the Semitic principle, and to Sinai, the mountain of the Jewish Moses, and to Calvary, the mountain of Christ, whom he called "the Jewish prince," he traced all noble inspiration. In "Tancred," in "Sybil," in his political biography and in fact everywhere where opportunity afforded, Disraeli gave vent to his racial enthusiasm, not contenting himself with words, but doing much to remove the civil disabilities of the Jews and to make possible their admission into Parliament.

Without going too far into the dangerous field of generalization, one may venture to point out what was characteristically un-English in Disraeli, and what was distinctly Disraelian rather

than Jewish. He was ostentatious in youth, mysterious in later life, always calm, sarcastic, impregnable before criticism, fluent in speech, and with that power of adaptability which has in all countries done so much for his kinsmen, but which in his case has sometimes led to the belief that he fashioned his principles according to the exigencies of his career, rather than moulded his life on the lines of fixed convictions. He had the manners and the ways of an outsider, a curious guest looking upon England as upon a chess board for his amusement and his advancement in fame, and upon the Queen, the knights and the bishops as so many pieces in his hands. And if, as one becomes convinced on closer study, he steadfastly adhered throughout his political career to what he chose to consider the cardinal principles of Toryism—the maintenance of the church, aristocracy and university, the development of the empire and the elevation of the masses—his attitude even here seems to have been prompted not chiefly by a feeling of pride in English national institutions, but rather by a sentiment of conservatism which he himself looked upon as distinctly Jewish. However, a more interesting racial trait in Disraeli was neither his love for satins and gold—a superficial orientalism, very possibly affected for the sake of attracting attention; nor the theoretic conservatism to some extent adopted as the easiest avenue to power; but rather that faculty of piercing beneath the layers of conventionality and artifice, of watching keenly the subtle workings of human motives and seeing as well as the pathos the humor of it all. This sense of humor was his, expressing itself not only in epigrams and caustic remarks, words burning themselves into the secret places of his rivals' feelings, but most clearly manifest in his calm judgment upon all life. It is because they have suffered so much that, as a race, the Jews are so deeply endowed with this quality, for humor and pathos are two colors intimately associated in the picture of life which the mind paints, or, rather are like one color, seen now in sunlight, now in shadow. The faculty of deep perception, not bitter, not malicious, this Disraeli possessed and with it inevitably the sense of humor. Disraeli shows in his novels that he saw clearly into the shallows of all that life of aristocratic luxury into which he wished to win his way. His power to be

among the dissipated and yet not of them, to dwell with luxury and yet not be weakened by it, to be in the midst of a world of insidious influences, surrounded by a wall of self, is Jewish rather than English. To some extent it is the history of Disraeli's race.

In his higher morality, however, if such a term is permissible, Disraeli was not representative of that people of whom he desired to be the modern star of glory. It is absurd to claim for the Jews all the praise which he lavished upon them. The modern world should not look with gratitude upon Jerusalem alone, and even if Christianity were Judaism for the multitude (which it certainly is not), the prophets and Christ are not the only influences that persist to-day and elevate the human soul. The Parthenon as well as the Temple must be seen with reverential eyes. The Greeks have infused into modern nations a sense of beauty, the Teutons an element of strength, a love for liberty based largely on respect for women, while our debt to the Romans, of which our institutions are an ever-existing reminder, cannot be considered as alone due anteriorly to the Jews. But what may with justice be said of them is this: they have been the torch-bearers of morality, and have stood forth, whether as Moses on Sinai or Isaiah in Jerusalem, Christ in the wilderness or each nameless martyr whom neither the Roman fire nor the Spanish rack could weaken, ever reverencing righteousness. Disraeli had no enthusiasm for right as right. In his early letters to his sister Sarah, the beloved "Sa" for whom his affection was deep and genuine, and to whom, if to any one, he would, it may be thought, have shown all the emotions of his heart as well as the thoughts of his mind, there is strangely seldom any reference to a devotion to high principles. Not youth alone is the time for ideals, but if they exist not in youth, it is little likely that they will appear in later life; and if love does not call forth their expression, nothing will. The motif of all the letters to his sister are: "I will succeed." They laughed at him when he first spoke in Parliament, and the uproar was so great that he was forced to sit down. "The time will come when you will hear me," he said as he took his seat. "*Forti nihil difficile*" was Disraeli's motto—to the strong nothing is difficult. Determination, courage, will; but nowhere

is there any evidence throughout a career on the whole kind and just, of an appreciation of justice as an irresistible command of the soul. In his attitude as a statesman, indefatigable in the maintenance of a policy which he believed would redound to the benefit of the constituencies which he served and the land in which he lived, and yet never actuated by the highest impulses of unselfish ideals, he was representative primarily of Disraeli, lacking that earnest righteousness which is the chief title to honor that Jewish character at its highest may claim.

But if we must deny Disraeli the homage that is due to the moral leaders of mankind, we may, nevertheless, accord him praise for his many undoubted qualities. He was the great individualist of English politics, with the imagination of a poet and the will of a warrior. In his dual capacity as the shrewd politician of infinite resource and as the statesman daring to dream of vast empire, he seems to me strikingly to combine both the practical and the ideal tendencies of the Jewish race.

After Disraeli's death the eminent Jewish critic, George Brandes, wrote a paper in which, dwelling on Disraeli's faults, he sought to establish the contention that the English statesman was not a representative Jew. Emma Lazarus, in a very able article, took the other position, and it is with her, rather, that we are glad to agree—glad because, for all his short-comings, we are proud to claim him. For earnest eyes, in scrutinizing that career which reached its summit at the Congress of Berlin, in gazing beyond the dark curtains of his shrewd ambitions, must find much to praise in the courage, the fidelity, the gratitude and magnanimity which characterized Disraeli, the proud defender of his race, the staunch friend of all his friends, the loyal husband of the Countess Beaconsfield, the benefactor of that Carlyle who reviled him, the student of Burke, the fearless and devoted servant of the Queen.

He is indeed a solitary figure among Englishmen, but not an inexplicable character. His faults and his virtues all must be reviewed in the light of his life as that of a man of genius with the radical weakness and strength of a selfish will. Prejudice of rank bowed down before him, and moved aside to let him pass. The Czar of all the Russias hesitated and obeyed when

Disraeli bade him go no further. Westminster Abbey would proudly have welcomed his dust to its fame-consecrated aisles. The sentiments of a world whose highest judgments are based on moral worth are not so easily affected by the versatility of a man's genius or the power of his wonderful personality. Yet we must admit—nay, we must maintain—that there is always something appealing and inspiring in the life of one who, ever keeping clear of dishonor,

Breaks his birth's invidious bar,
And grasps the skirts of happy chance,
And breasts the blow of circumstance
And grapples with his evil star.

Who makes by force his merit known,
And lives to clutch the golden keys,
To mould a mighty State's decrees,
And shape the whisper of the throne;

And moving up from high to higher,
Becomes on Fortune's crowning slope
The pillar of a people's hope,
The centre of a world's desire.

LOUIS LOEB — A TRIBUTE *

BY LEO MIELZINER

I COME to bear tribute to a friendship of nearly twenty years' standing; for it was in the fall of 1890 in Paris, at the old Academie Julian, in the Rue Faubourg St. Denis, that I came in contact for the first time with Louis Loeb; and almost immediately this fellow student and I became *copains*, chums.

In appearance he was slim but sturdy, and his pallor seemed only the contrast to his blue-black hair, to his red lips, and to his great black arching eyebrows, under which gleamed the most compelling eyes I have ever seen. These eyes were the dominant note in his physiognomy. Of unusual size, of unsurpassed brilliancy, they flashed fire or smouldered in brooding thought as mood and circumstance did prompt.

My senior by some years, I was proud of the unstinted friendship he gave me. But it was not the difference in years, important at that age, which prompted me to defer to his dominance. It was rather the intuitive recognition of his brilliant capacity, of his boundless energy, of his high ideals. I had come to Paris with the nebulous tentativeness of inexperienced youth. Louis Loeb at twenty-four was already a recognized master-lithographer, who had broken away from the limitations of his craft by years of night work at the League, and had come to Paris with a definite purpose and a well-defined program of study. With might and main and method, he set for himself the task of acquiring mastery in the difficult technique of painting, so that he might have at his command a proper medium in which adequately to express on canvas the poetry with which his fertile mind already teemed.

So it was as mentor as well as friend that I looked up to

* Address delivered at a meeting in memory of Louis Loeb, February 13, 1910.

him; and in all the ensuing years of the closest comradeship, on my side there was always the deference of the student to the master, an attitude never demanded by him, but ever freely and proudly felt and expressed by me. For, aside from his eminent ability as an artist, there was a quality of brain, or I should say, an attitude of mind, which lifted him to a high plane among men of great intellect.

The vicissitudes of his early life had precluded prolonged schooling. But once steeped in the Old World art, once awakened to Old World culture, his avid mind and his oneness of purpose led him instinctively to the very fountain-head of intellectual stimulus. With his innate love of beauty, and his peculiar sensitiveness to delicate form, he naturally turned to the Greek classics, and in them found the Alma Mater which had been denied him in his early youth. Reaching this storehouse of knowledge and culture at a maturer age than most students, with a fixed philosophy of life, and a definite recognition of his own temperamental needs, he did not gourmandize at this feast, but, with delicate perception and intuitive precision, discerned, selected and absorbed only the choice bits which his particular ego demanded.

His friendships were ever chosen in the same spirit—for the intellectual and emotional stimulus they brought to him and to his art, and not for any ulterior motives. For Louis Loeb had great pride and little vanity. His close intimacies with men and women in high places might have procured for him the social recognition which seems almost a *sine qua non* of worldly success; but his absorption in his work and above all, his almost selfish persistence in guarding intact his own view-point as poet and painter, precluded the entanglements of mere social distractions and obligations. He was a true aristocrat. Many knew him, but his intimates were few. Though he jealously guarded his active vitality for his art, his leisure hours he passed freely and joyously in sharpening his brain in the clash of argument with the big men of other professions and activities; with eminent writers and divines, with legal and medical lights, with editors and captains of industry, with high financiers and philanthropists, with scientists and musicians.

From each he flashed fire, to light up a new facet of his art, whose warm reflecting glow in turn illumined each. To the student, however humble, he was ever lavish with his time and thought. After severing his connections as professor at the League, he would accept no pupils for pay. But no former student, in fact, no aspiring tyro, was ever denied his door in search of criticism and help. He often told me that that was one of the luxuries he allowed himself.

This sympathetic and helpful attitude towards the young student was quite natural, for he never ceased to possess himself the student's eagerness, wonder and hunger for knowledge and advancement.

Six weeks before his death when his dread disease had already deprived him of his strength, and we had planned to spend the summer in a quiet nook in the foothills of the White Mountains, he went up there, not as an invalid, but burdened with painting paraphernalia and laden with a library of classics. After regaining the health he sought, we were to paint and study together under the pines until late into the fall. Alas! the grim reaper had other plans. His paints remained untouched, and his books unopened and eternal sleep shut out the light of those glorious eyes. But the lustre of his life abides with us.

THE JEWS AND THE ECONOMIC LIFE *

A REVIEW OF WERNER SOMBART'S BOOK

BY DR. SAMUEL SCHULMAN

RARELY have we read a book that was so full of scientific terminology and had so little of the scientific spirit, that made such a display of learning of all parts, and was, nevertheless, dominated by the style of the pamphleteer, that was such a continued protest, like that of Hamlet's mother, of its impartiality and opposition to anti-Semitism, and yet betrayed most subtly the zeal of the accuser and the special pleading of the advocate. The fault that Sombart imputes to the Jewish religion, of being an artificial system, projected externally upon nature and not a philosophy of life growing out of it, he himself commits. He has not studied the Jewish religion in every aspect in order fairly to report upon it. He has not sought to analyze the Jewish character by investigating various types of Jewish personality, but he artificially announces a theory with a characteristic abstract terminology, in order to make out that the Jew, from the moment that he appears in history, is by his very blood, by his nomadic life, by his psychical individuality and by his religion, best fitted to create and develop capitalism. This theory makes up two-thirds of the book, and everything in Jew and Judaism must be twisted to conform to this theory. Capitalism and Judaism are for him synonymous. Being himself feudal in mental attitude and an aristocrat in temperament, he hates capitalism and he makes the Jews and Judaism exclusively capitalistic in spirit. Therefore, his animus toward the latter can be easily guessed. He is the most subtle of anti-Semites, just because he is constantly surrounding his nasty insinuations, which are by no means novel, with a cloud of words on every page, by which he is ever

* Address delivered before the Judæans, February 25, 1912.

impressing us with his protests that he is not an anti-Semite. He has thus been able to impose even upon many Jews, especially as in the first part of the book, which is descriptive and historical, he gives no mean tribute to the Jewish contribution to the commercial, industrial and financial development of the Western world.

He is nasty in his very introductory paragraph to the Jewish religion, which describes its creation. From the start, he makes it out to be everything repulsive—a cold-blooded concoction by a dry scribe, artificially imposed upon a people for a definite purpose. He constantly insinuates dishonesty of the Jew, though he seeks to mollify his statements by saying that they were only guilty of those things which are at present recognized as the commonplaces of business. He makes the Jew treat the non-Jew always with a desire to overreach and to take advantage of him. He questions a Jewish sense of honor, or a possession of personal dignity. He makes the Jew live only for money. He intimates that he can never strike root in any soil; that he can never really have a country; that the blood of the desert is in his veins, which makes him an eternal wanderer, a nomad. And aside from a left-handed compliment to his family life, as making for an economic international solidarity, and through its purity, making for capitalistic efficiency, he has not one word to say for Jews and Judaism, as great moral and spiritual forces in history.

I said that the book is unscientific. He never proves anything. After pages of introduction in scientific methodology, preparing the reader for an earnest effort at scientific proof, we get again and again the assertion that after all, the layman is equally qualified to pass judgment. And judgment is passed upon the basis of what is called intuition, a personal observation and experience, which means, of course, subjectivism, or put plainly, preconceived notion and prejudice. In the last analysis, we always have an *ipse dixit*, never a clinching proof. Prof. Sombart does not prove that the Jewish religion produced capitalism. It would be indeed an absurd expectation, since Judaism lived twenty-five hundred years, adapting itself to all kinds of economic life before modern capitalism was born. He does not prove what his thesis imposes upon him the duty to do, that the Jews would

have become, in the Western world, the exclusive traders, money-lenders, wanderers from one ghetto to another, if it were not for external circumstances and conditions, for the method of oppression to which they were exposed, which is, as is known, the classic interpretation of their historic experience, but he insists that what the Jew experienced in history was the result of his own individuality. To do this, he is compelled deliberately to sweep away historic facts, such as that the Jews were even agriculturists in their own land, that there ever was a time when they were anything but money-lenders. He even fails to prove that there is such a thing as a Jewish race, in his own sense of the word, as a group possessing certain anthropological qualities inhering in their blood. He fails to prove what is the main theme which carries all his assertions, that the blood is more effective in the development of the individuality than environment. And through his dogmatism he does not become aware of the great contradiction, which mars the whole inception of the work and therefore proclaims its artificiality. In one part of the book he says that sometimes a quality may inhere in the blood (he is attempting to answer why in ancient times the Jews were warriors and not merely traders, and so forth) and not become active until the environment calls it forth. Therefore it would seem that environment plays a great rôle in shaping national character, and strictly speaking, the blood is an unknown quality, and therefore can reveal potencies according to various environments. But conversely, his book, he tells us, was written because he was impressed by Max Weber's "Puritanism and Capitalism." This work led him to investigate whether an intimate relation between Judaism and Capitalism could not equally and even with more force, be asserted. Now, Puritanism and Judaism are for Sombart practically identical. But if so, we ask, was it the blood of the Puritans who belonged to a Northern people, whose ancestors were of the forest and not of the desert, who clung to the soil and were not nomads, who were blessed by the dampness of the woods and enjoyed the mystic possibilities of the fog, and who were not cursed by the blasting sun and sharpened by the immenseness of star-studded skies (do not laugh, it is exactly in some such rhetoric that Sombart contrasts nomad who is Jew,

and Northern man)—was it the blood, we ask, that made Puritan England capitalistic, that made the men scions of English yeomanry, the leaders of the capitalistic system, or was it the new industrial conditions, general, historical, commercial and economic development? We leave him on the horns of the dilemma and he can take his choice.

I need not stop to say that, of course, every activity in organic and historic life is the result of a subject and object, of blood or psychological endowment and conditions or environment. If the blood of the Puritan made him a capitalist, what becomes of the theory that the peculiarity of the blood of the Jewish nomad hurled him from his origin to northern lands and made him most fitted for capitalistic life? If the conditions turn the Puritan to capitalism, why does not Sombart defer to the classic historic explanation that industrially and economically the Jew was made by his environment and not by his blood and certainly not by his religion, which for Sombart is the expression of the Jew's peculiarity or individuality? Let Prof. Sombart take which horn of the dilemma he prefers, we are sure that we see the cloven-hoof of anti-Semitism in the book, whose science about the Jew and Judaism is fantastic, but whose animus is a bloody fact, trailing Jewish history from Apion to his own very striking personality. A Jew who knows his religion cannot like such a book, despite his glorification of us as capitalists, and his tribute to us for our industrial, commercial and financial service to the Western world.

The way to meet Sombart is to meet him on his own ground and to vindicate the philosophy of Jewish life as based on the very features of abstractness, legality, rationalism, this-worldliness and purposiveness of the Jewish spirit or Judaism which he indeed caricatures. Sombart presents a caricature of the Jewish religion. What is a caricature? It is in the form of a cartoon, a pretended likeness of a person, which, while it enables the beholder to recognize the original, because of true traits which are in it, yet on account of the omission of other traits, which are indissolubly mixed with them in the original, in real life, and on account of the exaggerations and distortions of the few traits reproduced, creates a result intended either to excite ridicule or aversion. Instead of a characterization of a face in such a car-

toon, we get what is called a caricature. This is exactly what Sombart has done with Judaism. As a cartoonist, he understands certain features of Judaism. He deliberately distorts them and therefore fails to appreciate their real significance, and he purposely omits many features which are indispensable to a true valuation of the Jewish religion and the Jewish philosophy of life.

Let us see what he omits. He gives us a picture of the Jewish religion, without dwelling on the teachings of the Prophets, who for him are a "desert chorus." Yet these Prophets are read every week in the synagogue and are constantly influencing the minds of the people. He has nothing to say of the religiosity of the Psalms. He neglects entirely the soul of the problem of the Book of Job—the maturing of the Jewish wisdom, in which the hero learns to trust in God even though he slays him—a book not by any means limited to the reading of the few, but recommended to every Jew in time of bereavement and sorrow, and thus exerting a vital influence on Jewish thought and the spirit of Jewish life. He neglects the influence of the Haggadah, although in one line, the remark escapes him, that it fed the "*gemueth*." We could hardly believe our eyes when we read this. So, after all, the Jews were not merely calculating machines of profits, but actually had heart and *gemueth*. He seems not to know of the existence of the Jewish mystics. He has not a word to say about the significance of the Messianic hope. And aside from incidental mention of alms-giving, he leaves untouched the philanthropic side of Jewish activity, the great rôle that beneficence plays in Jewish religious life. And of course, what is called Reform Judaism and its related phenomena in the course of Jewish history, are entirely left out. In other words, he eliminates prophecy, poetry, tragedy, mysticism and world-embracing hope, from Judaism, and then he naively tells us that the Jewish religion is a pure matter of the calculating understanding—a sort of commercial contract between God, before whom the Jew is constantly trembling, and the devotee, who is keeping a strict bookkeeping as to his merits and demerits.

So much for the things he does not mention. What he does emphasize, he distorts, because he uses it for a definite purpose,

and therefore, he abuses it. It is true, he tells us, that he is making a study of the relations of Judaism as a religion, to capitalism, and he must emphasize only those features of it which bear on his subject. But as Judaism was never intended to be an apology for, or a prelude to capitalism, it is a gross injustice to our religion to present it in this artificial and unscientific description. The fact is that many social reformers and even socialists in this capitalistic world are going for their ethical inspiration to the Hebrew Prophets. This is a commonplace well known to any one who is at all in touch with modern thought. It was his duty to point out the larger bearings of Judaism. This theory, which makes the heart of his book, is simple, ingenious, but utterly artificial. It consists of four quadruplets—there is capital, there is Judaism, there is Jewish individuality, and there is the nomad with his original Jewish blood. Each one of these reveals certain characteristics. Ergo, they are all intimately and organically cemented together. The characteristics of capitalism are abstractness, rationalism, purposiveness, profit. There are certain traits in Judaism—abstractness, contract between man and God, rationalism of life, purpose. There are certain qualities of Jewish individuality which explain the religion—excessive mentality or intellectualism, concentration upon aim, purposiveness, mobility, and resulting from them, restlessness and adaptability. Lastly, the Jewish blood is that of the nomad. And here again, the abstractness, the want of the concrete life in the desert, the concentrating purpose to amass herds, the rootlessness in the soil, and intellectual and physical mobility, quick adaptation to a new oasis, quick flight by the camel; the restlessness and adaptability shown in being to-day at one oasis and to-morrow at another. Perhaps you think I am parodying this thesis, but I am simply reproducing the thoughts of the book. It is a beautiful scheme. In the nomad you have already the future capitalist, the transition made through the Jewish soul and through Judaism. All by the happy use of a few abstract phrases. It is romantic, subjective philosophy at its worst. It is certainly not science or a study of religion. Capitalism is abstract, it is artificial, it is carried on for gain, it cares not for persons, only for things, it aims at money as the common denominator. It is mobile and

adaptable. Judaism is a cold, abstract, artificial, calculating, earthy, materialistic religion, therefore, money is the religion of the Jew. Therefore, the Jews make the best capitalists. Even to make out such a caricature of a case, he has to perform some remarkable stunts, with respect to the Jewish religion. In the first place, he misses mysticism in the Jewish religion. There is no absorption in nature or in God. It is all cold and rational. Has he ever seen a real Jew pray, in a synagogue where people actually do pray? Has he seen him shut his eyes, and with perfect devotion and with an ecstasy of joy, proclaim the unity of God in reciting the Shema? Of course, it is not a mysticism like that of the character in Plautus' comedy, who excuses his having seduced a woman, because the god forced him to do it. Even such an absorption in the god, such an intoxication, Prof. Sombart points out as superior to the frigid rational religion of the Jew. Again, religion he maintains, is for the Jew a bargain. The Jew, according to him, can't even pray, if he comes empty-handed. He must always have something to give God, in the form of meritorious service, if he asks help from Him. And he quotes some Rabbinic saying to buttress this up. Aside from the fact that he misses the ethical vigor in this doctrine of prayer, that we should indeed prepare to meet God with our virtues and not be empty beggars for a capricious favor, thus making our prayer a flowering out of our conduct, he seems to be blissfully oblivious of the fact that every Jew was supposed to pray every morning, asking God's grace: "not because of our righteousness, do we bring our petitions before Thee, but because of the greatness of Thy mercy." He makes the Jew keep books about his religion, constantly anxious that his merits outnumber his transgressions. I know many Jews and many orthodox and pious ones. I have lived in intimacy with a very pious Jew. The dominant note rather was his humility and not the sharpness of his theological bookkeeping. What Sombart thus parodies is really a grand thing. It is that which is known in the traditional Jewish life as the "*Heshbon Hanefesh*," which means, "the soul taking an account of itself," from time to time, getting a glimpse into its own mechanism, becoming aware of its moral assets, whether it is solvent or threatened with bankruptcy. This is

certainly no mean occupation, except for the person who prefers the divine intoxication of the character in Plautus' comedy, and looks with something of the contempt of the Bohemian upon the morality of self-control. He makes the Jew—and there he follows all the Christian theologians that attack Judaism—have a purely formal, legal, external religion. He has no idea of those fundamental principles of Jewish life, which have become concentrated into epigrams, always a characteristic of wisdom that has become popular. The Rabbinical sayings,—“Sanctify thyself, even in things that are allowed thee,” and “these are matters given over to the heart,” which law cannot altogether touch, such statements, together with the well-known one, “God desires the heart, no matter whether one gives more or less,” show sufficiently what the real spirit of the Jewish religion was, and that the motive in the heart was everything. Not to speak of the mental habit, as one might call it, of the Talmud, which seeks to summarize and condense the whole law in one striking statement, thus indicating that it is the spirit and not the letter that decides the value of a deed, and that gives the purpose of the disciplinary work of the law. Prof. Sombart makes wealth the whole purpose of the Jew's life, and in order to do so, he has even to mis-translate such a well-known Rabbinical passage as, “Who is rich? He who rejoices in his lot.” He makes the Jew lack the sense for personality, the appreciation of persons. He is only addicted, according to him, abstractly to things and qualities. The beautiful conception of personality and its influence on the ethical life, where such influence was allowed, is revealed in Jewish charity, whereby, we are taught, according to Hillel, that if a wealthy man, who had come down in the world, had once possessed a horse, genuine generosity and sympathy would prompt us to give him one. This may be an exaggerated statement. What it, however, means, is that in practicing beneficence, we should have regard for the personality, his culture, his past condition, his individual life. A beneficiary is not a unit on the list, but a living person. That, to my mind, is the best exercise of the sense for personality. He despises the cardinal virtues of the Jews—self-control, thoughtfulness, orderliness, industry, abstinence, chastity, sobriety. Indeed, he has a horror of Jewish

chastity. Of course, they are for him mainly philistine virtues. What can we expect of one who criticises the Jew and the capitalistic economy because of their insistence that expenses should never be larger than income—an idea, as he tells us, utterly opposed to all feudal economy. We can understand why feudal economy came to an end. He makes the Jew lack enthusiasm and joy. Has he ever read of Hillel taking part in the tabernacle festival at the ceremony of the water drawing? Has he ever been in a conventicle of Hasidim, to make a leap of two thousand years? He knows nothing of Jewish idealism—at least he says nothing in the book—as revealed in the life of the student, in the martyrdom of a people and in its glorious hope.

Now, I see in the fundamental Jewish ideas when conceived in their proper relation to other elements in Judaism, and when properly understood, the very glories of Judaism. Prof. Sombart simply echoes ideas which have become the commonplaces of the critics of Judaism. The Jewish conception of God, we are told, is abstract, it is a formula in which the universe is narrowed, the poetic wealth of the world and life shrinks. It is a desert idea, with no color or life in it, to which the Jew clings with fanaticism, because of the intensity of his will, and because of his incapacity to appreciate the beauties of nature, and to personify them in the form of gods, or tell their stories in the creation of myths. Therefore, the Jews were not at all creative in religion. As Sombart puts it, they were perhaps the least religious people. They only tremble before their One Power. It is quite true, the Jew does not say every morning, "Thou shalt tremble before the Lord thy God." But he does say, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might." Such a little matter, of course, can easily be overlooked. The truth is, however, that the great creative genius of the Prophetic mind that revealed God, consisted in this, that it concentrated the religious thought in the conception of the one spiritual God, abstracted from the visible universe. These anti-Semitic scholars that speak so glibly of the abstractness and the rational character of the Jewish religion, making it out purely a matter of the understanding, lacking depth, poetry and mystery, have never asked themselves why it is that in the Bible

there is so little argumentation about God. Does this lack of argumentation not imply a great intuition? The Prophetic genius created a religion deliberately without myths, because the religion was to be ethical and spiritual. And the value of such a religion is immense. The so-called abstract God gives complete freedom to the human intellect. Myths, especially, when they become petrified into dogmas, prove stumbling-blocks for the intellect and snares for morality. The Jewish conception of God chains Him to no fact in nature, identifies Him with no event in the past, completely exhausts Him in no personality. The intellect, therefore, has complete freedom to roam through the universe, through literature, and through all history and biography. No natural law discovered will make God any the less necessary. No critical investigation of any literature will ever destroy in a Jewish heart the hold on the One, and no removal of the halo from any hero because of the destruction of myth by historic truth will, for a Jew, ever destroy his God. It is the purely spiritual conception of God as beyond nature and unexhausted in any concrete manifestation of life, which gives the intellect complete freedom. And it is not for naught, as Sombart himself recognizes, that one aspect of the Jewish religion lays above all, stress on knowledge, on study, and that the synagogue is called a *shule*. This is a glory of our religion, that we serve God with our intellects, as well as with other sides of our nature.

The central virtue in the Jewish ethical system is justice, and justice looks indeed, not to personality, but to principle. And it must be emphasized that to our mind the radical distinction between Judaism and other religions is that it indeed makes principle superior to personality. Before the principle of the absolute unity of God, all personalities in history disappear. They are not perfect enough to be divine. And before the principle of abstract right, personal considerations must necessarily vanish. This is not a weakness of our religion, but it is a great strength. When you are doing charity, manifesting love, you embrace the whole person. When you are trying to discover what is true and right and just, you must abstract from personal considerations. Rationalization and holiness are

indeed the purpose of life. Life is governed, according to Jewish teaching, by law. Sombart tells us that a Jew always looks to the *Tachlith*—the purpose. We admit this. We do not see here a disadvantage, but rather a great praise of Jewish life and character. All human beings must some time, and in some form, ask themselves the purpose of life. The Jewish answer was, "to obey the law of God." Law is indeed the essence of Judaism. This may strike you as a paradox, coming from one who is a representative of Reform Judaism, but if Reform says of some laws, that they no longer express our religious feeling and are no longer adaptable to our environment, it has by no means broken with the conception of law as the discipline of life. If it ever did this, it would cease to be Judaism.

I recently had a remarkable experience, which proved to me how profoundly contemporary thought was producing antinomianism in various directions. I was conversing with a liberal Christian theologian on various matters, and he suddenly burst out and said: "Who cares, what does the universe care, for the little Jewish law? It is the Northern races that were creative. They were the artists, the builders, the doers. I ask what a man does, how he enriches the world and life. We can forgive Goethe a half-dozen sexual infidelities, because of the great works he left behind." This seemed to me an unexpected, but a very effective presentation of the Nietzschean antinomian attitude. I answered and said that he was altogether wrong. That the law was not intended to create. Human nature creates and the Jew has done his share of creating, instructing and doing in the world. But that the truth is, Judaism excuses no immoralities by the privilege of genius. A man remains a fraction of a man, even if with that fraction he reveals something of the beauties and glories of nature, as long as he has not risen to the full stature of manhood, and learned to govern himself. A poet can no more help singing than can a lark, insofar as he is a poet. But if the poet is to be a full man, he must learn to govern his instincts, passions, desires, his life, by a law which he imposes upon himself, and which in the last analysis, and in the deeper sense, is the law of life imposed upon him by the Divine Author of it. When our Heinrich

Heine ceased to be a young Hellene, after, so to speak, he had sown his wild oats, he too, learned, as he tells us, in the magnificent passage in his "Confessions," that the greatest artist of the world's history was Moses, who created a monumental people by giving them the Law. There is no escape from this, and therefore, we maintain that the so-called legal character of the Jewish religion, in all its awfulness, in all its sublimity, is its great glory. And after all, there is not such a great distance between the Jewish conception of the majesty of the law and Kant's vindication of the sublimity of the moral law. Light livers may not like it. But nonetheless, it is a reality, and expresses, as Sombart admits, the battle, the contrast between sense and morality, which is raging "in all of us."

The Jewish attitude to nature is also, to my mind, one of the glories of Judaism. The Jew was not insensitive to the beauties of nature. He could comprehend them intellectually and was thrilled by them emotionally. Religiously, he deliberately reduced them to the garb, and refused to see in them the spirit of God. Certainly, Alexander von Humboldt, a scientist and poet, understood something of the beauties of nature, and he says in his "Cosmos," that the 104th Psalm is perhaps the most beautiful hymn on nature in the world's literature. Sombart thinks that the Jew can't enjoy nature, that he has no real feeling for a beautiful landscape, and why, do you think? Because he is so rational, he stands so outside of it and his thought is so influenced by his religion, which enmeshes life, that he only looks upon it as an occasion to make a "beracho," that is to say, a benediction. This is certainly an amusing criticism. I would say that the Jew enjoys nature as a connoisseur enjoys a work of art. He enjoys the effect of the art upon his soul as does any ordinary man. In addition, he admires, knowingly, the virtuosity of the master. A Jew enjoys nature, and in addition, enjoys in thought the presence of the Infinite Artist, and praises Him for His work. Morally, our attitude to nature is a three-fold one. We may become absorbed in nature, live our lives irrespective of good and evil, follow our impulses, sink into nature, into the most pleasant places thereof, and thus become a beast. We may be afraid of nature

and run away from it. That is the monastic ideal. Lastly, we may remain within nature and in the world, and govern nature by divine law and human moral purpose. The Jew neither sinks into nature nor runs away from it. He uses it and takes every instinct and desire, moralizes it and sanctifies it. The purposiveness of the Jewish mind simply means the early grasp of the doctrine of consequences and the law of compensation. This is absolutely true. It is the fundamental law of life. If you sow the wind, you reap the whirlwind. That Judaism took this law and made it part of religion, is only another proof of its truth and sanity. If, however, anyone would conclude from this, that the Jew became a selfish, shrewd, calculating machine, serving God only for rewards and trembling because of threatened punishments, he would either be mistaken, or be wilfully misleading. For what is the meaning of the Book of Job? The solution of the problem is already given to the reader in the prologue. If any anti-Semitic theologian, philosopher, or economist, with satanic sarcasm, should assert that Job serves God only because he is wealthy and has a house full of children, and is happy, and that Israel only serves God for the sake of the earthly blessings of wealth and prosperity, then he will get his answer in this remarkable tragic experience of the great hero, who works his way to the grandest conception in literature, that of clinging to his God, despite friends that misunderstand him and cruelly rebuke him, despite his own misfortunes and sufferings. Job proves that he can cling to his Friend or Redeemer, despite the fact that he not only has all his rewards swept away, but is purified in the crucible by terrible calamities. And Israel, who taught the world the doctrine of consequences, did not turn it into a slavish hope of reward or fear of punishment, because thus far, he has served God, not because of the prosperity, but rather, despite the adversity that the world made him suffer. He has proven himself to be the unselfish servant of the Eternal. The tragic destiny of Israel in history, is the living refutation of the whole theory of anti-Semitic criticism. If Judaism were only a religion based on narrow, rational self-interest, it would have perished long ago. The threats of the world sought to force

the Jew from his religion, the blandishments sought to entice him away from his religion. But he clings to God, because the great *Tachlith*, the great purpose of the world and life is the eventual moralization, sanctification and perfecting of humanity, the redemption of the race by God's law. That is the kernel of the Messianic hope. This is the inspiration of the glorious vision of the Jew. Yes, the Jew is an optimist. He affirms the value of life. He is "*welt-bejahend*." And it is no accident that many of the most virulent anti-Semites of the nineteenth century were influenced by a pessimistic philosophy. The Jew, as Browning well interpreted his wisdom, says: "Grow old with me, the best is yet to be." Or as Ibsen makes Peer Gynt say, "I learned from the Jew to wait." The Jew has a religion with a God truly spiritual, with a law absolutely authoritative, which demands government of the life of every human being, with a purpose, which means moralization and sanctification, with a spirit of sublime self-sacrifice, which makes him loyally wait for his reward, but with a martyr's patience, for the triumph of truth. And while he waits, he must put up with many such a caricature of his religion as is that presented by the author whose work we have been reviewing.

THE JEW IN HIS RELATION TO THE LAW OF THE LAND *

BY MAX J. KOHLER

THE "law of the land" which governs us, is in large degree a product of Jewish contributions to civilization. It has been well pointed out by Rudolph von Ihering, the distinguished jurist, that our whole civilization may properly be described as "a struggle for law," that every legal system develops slowly and laboriously, and in consequence of efforts to maintain the rights of the individual against assault, and does not spring, like Minerva, full-grown from Jupiter's head; that the individual's unceasing struggle for his rights is a fundamental condition for the development of civilization, and that "when the legal rights of the individual are sacrificed, the law is sacrificed likewise." In a beautiful passage which has often been commented upon, he portrays Shylock in Shakespeare's masterpiece as the champion for law, and it is by no mere accident that the Jew was selected as the struggler for rights:

"If you defy me, fie upon your law!
There is no force in the decrees of Venice
. . . . I crave the law
. . . . I stay here on my bond."

Von Ihering says: "I crave the law. These four words change Shylock's claim into a question of the law of Venice. To what mighty, giant dimensions does not the weak man grow when he speaks these words? It is no longer the Jew demanding his pound of flesh, it is the law of Venice itself, knocking at the door of justice; for his rights and the law of Venice are

* A paper read at the meeting of the Judeans in honor of Judge Mack and Judge Mayer, in New York, April 14, 1912.

one and the same; they both stand or fall together. And when he finally succumbs under the weight of the judge's decision, who wipes out his rights by a shocking piece of pleasantry, when we see him pursued by bitter scorn, bowed, broken, tottering on his way, who can help feeling that in him the law of Venice is humbled; that it is not the Jew Shylock, who moves painfully away, but the typical figure of the Jew in the Middle Ages, that pariah of society, who cried in vain for justice? His fate is eminently tragic, not because his rights are denied him, but because he, a Jew of the Middle Ages, has faith in the law . . . a faith firm as a rock, which nothing can shake . . . until the catastrophe breaks upon him like a thunderclap, dispels the illusion, and teaches him that he is only the despised mediæval Jew to whom Justice is done by defrauding him." ("The Struggle for Law," translated by J. J. Lalor, pp. 80-1.)

I will not quote von Ihering's analysis of this trial scene, and his contention that the bond should itself have been adjudged null and void, because its provisions were contrary to good morals, instead of conceding its validity, but by a wretched subterfuge preventing its enforcement. Nor will I stop to point out that historical research indicates that Shylock's real prototype in this instance was a Christian, and that it was a Jew who executed the fateful bond. The point I want to make is that our entire concept of enforcement of law and obedience to the law, which underlies our whole civilization, is largely due to an acceptance of the principles of our "Old Testament."

When the Teutons, with their love of liberty and individuality, overthrew the Roman Empire, and accepted the Christian faith, it was the principles of the Old Testament, as distinguished from the New, that became the cornerstone of our civilization. The passages of the Jewish Bible which inculcate the administration of justice and establish its divine attributes, are of course innumerable; the whole spirit of Judaism is permeated with the spirit of justice. Let it suffice to cite, for example, the famous lines of Micah (VI 8): "Thou hast been told, O man, what is good and what the Lord requireth

of thee: to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly before thy God," with the prime emphasis on the first requirement, to do justly.

In contrast with this, we turn to the New Testament, and read in Matthew (V 38-41) the famous passage: "Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee and take thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." So also, in 1 Corinthians, VI 7, we read "Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. Why not rather take wrong, why not rather be defrauded?" Finally, it is said in Matthew (V 33-4): "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths, but I say unto you, Swear not at all." It is obvious that these precepts are part of a system which is quite inconsistent with social order and civilization, and that their logical execution requires a separation from society and civilization, as Tolstoy taught in our own day. Accordingly, in building our system of laws and civilization, the precepts of the New Testament were disregarded, and our social structure erected upon Old Testament foundations. Nor did the Teutons enshrine the Roman law, which had worked their oppression, for the same was inconsistent with the spirit of individuality and personal liberty which they stood for, disregarded the rights of all who were not Roman citizens, and made wife and children slaves of the head of the household.

I repeat, then, that our whole sense of law-abidingness and justice is essentially Jewish in its origin. Matthew Arnold has beautifully expressed this same idea in "Literature and Dogma," where he says: "The true Israel was Israel, the bringer-in and defender of the idea of conduct, Israel the lifter-up to the nations of the banner of righteousness, the true Jerusalem was the city of the ideal Israel. And this ideal Israel will not and cannot perish, so long as his idea, righteousness and its necessity, does not perish, but prevails. . . . Greece was the lifter-up to the nations of the banner of art and science, as Israel was the lifter-up of the banner of righteousness.

. . . Conduct, plain matter as it is, is six-eighths of life, while art and science are only two-eighths."

It is not strange that this craving for justice and its enforcement has developed a spirit of litigiousness in the Jew, but any one familiar with the benefits of these teachings to civilization, will not chide him for it. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The same trait is strongly developed in the Englishman, with his tenacity for the maintenance of his rights, and doubtless this also can be traced back to the Puritans' love for the Old Testament, for, as Matthew Arnold said, "The Reformation was strong in that it was an earnest return to the Bible and to doing from the heart the will of God as there written." Dr. A. Schmiedl, who applied von Ihering's theory more specifically to Jewish law in an interesting little monograph entitled "Die Lehre vom Kampf um's Recht im Verhältniss zu dem Judenthum und dem ältestem Christenthum," quotes some apt passages from the Rabbins to the same effect.

The Talmud says that only to those departing from life, to the dying, should one say, "Go in peace!" for as long as man dwells on this earth, it is his duty to fight for right and truth, though peace should be his ultimate ideal (Beracha 64a). Also that "it is immaterial whether the object of the controversy be a penny or a hundred ducats" (Sanhedrin 8a). Under the influence of such precepts, as Deuteronomy I 17, "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; ye shall hear the small and the great alike; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man, for the judgment is God's," prophet and law-giver warned and rebuked even the mighty king in his palace, and the principles of equality before the law and impartial justice were evolved for all civilization.

So also, it is to the Jew that we must turn for the "Origin of Republican Form of Government in the United States," for the source of democratic self-government, a government of law, and the principle of written constitutions, as Oscar S. Straus has well pointed out in his book on the "Origin" of our government.

Nay, more, the fundamental principles of our present jurisprudence are still Jewish. The ten commandments still underly

our jurisprudence, as do also scores of other Biblical laws concerning morality, blasphemy, marriage and divorce, and the like. Charlemagne enacted whole chapters from the Bible as civil laws for his empire, as did King Alfred in England, while Puritan New England in modern times literally enacted the Old Testament as civil law. When we are to determine what is inherently right or wrong, our appeal to-day is still primarily to the Jewish Bible.

The closing days of the Roman Empire found the Jews acquiring rights of Roman citizenship, though Rome had been disposed to recognize as binding for its subject nations, their own peculiar laws and customs, as Theodore Reinach has well pointed out. The Rabbis in the Talmud were beginning to evolve the doctrine that the "law of the land" wherein they dwelt, superseded the Jewish law as to all civil and political rights. But with the overthrow of Rome, however, the Jews found themselves in European lands under all the disabilities of aliens, on the one hand, which meant being wholly outside of the pale of the ordinary laws, while, on the other, their religion caused a series of new disabilities, dictated by the interests of the hostile established Church.

Accordingly, the "law of the land" was not for them, and they acquired only such rights as they were able to purchase or beg from the rulers whose "Kammer-Knechte" they became. Unfortunately, the history of Jewish laws in European countries has thus far been studied only in the most fragmentary fashion, and we are unable to trace satisfactorily the influence of the Jewish laws of the Middle Ages upon the "law of the land."

The interesting investigations of Schleiden, Mommsen, Gans, Roscher, Stobbe, and our own Prof. Gross furnish clues, however, which are now being pursued by several competent jurists, notably by Scherer in his "Rechtsverhältnisse der Juden in den deutsch-oesterreichischen Ländern" (Vol. I, published in 1901), and Riggs in England, whose records of the Exchequer of the Jews are being published jointly by the Selden Society and the Jewish Historical Society of England. They already tend to show that the principles of the law governing our commercial and industrial life, are in large degree an adoption by the

general commercial communities, of laws evolved by and for the Jews. The accidental circumstance that the Jews were the chattels of the king, fortunately for them, took them outside the shackles of the feudal system, and made their lives largely their own, for their own commercial and individual development, instead of their being mere cogs in a revolving military system.

As the kings periodically and spasmodically taxed and plucked the Jews in their own behalf, when in their chronic condition of needing money, they early discovered that it was in their own interest to enable Jews to amass wealth under special privileges and grants, which were originally far in excess of those enjoyed by their non-Jewish subjects. Accordingly, the Jews were permitted to take interest for lending money, while the Church and civil law as well denied such rights to the non-Jews. Right in the Jew to purchase property and acquire title, even though the goods were stolen in warfare or otherwise, was also soon developed, as long as there were no visible indications of theft. Subsequently the Jews developed the use and the law of negotiable paper, and the law merchant was undoubtedly largely Jewish in its origin. Religious antagonism, and discriminations in favor of the Jews, as well as jealousies born of them, aroused strong anti-Semitism, as did also the rise of cities and guilds that succeeded in following the example of the Jews in similar commercial pursuits. Accordingly, as Roscher, the economist, has well pointed out, the economic rise and development of European cities and guilds in the Middle Ages were attended by the establishment and extension of cruel Jewish disabilities of a far-reaching character, as the economic world was no longer so dependent upon the Jews, and conversely, development of special Jewish jurisdiction, accordingly grew side by side, and subsisted, until the return of the Jews to England in Cromwell's day and the upheavals of the French Revolution.

To return to the laws regulating the conduct of the Jews in the Middle Ages, however, we find Jews cut off from the "law of the land," and compelled to develop their own special laws under conflicting royal grants and their own customs. Their

religious practices, their disabilities, and particularly the special "Jewish Taxes," for which the whole Jewish community jointly was held responsible, compelled them to develop their own Jewish jurisdiction, in order to collect from each family its share of the communal taxes, and otherwise to control the individual's conduct. Over controversies between Jews and non-Jews, Jewish tribunals were, of course, not permitted to take jurisdiction, but in adjusting their relations to, and controversies with, each other, they established all sorts of remedies and punishments, including power of excommunication.

In fact, under heavy penalties, Jews were forbidden to invoke the non-Jewish tribunals, and fear of disclosure of communal activities induced them to punish most severely betrayers of their own faith. The records of the Portuguese Jewish Community of Hamburg, beginning about 1650, are now being published, and indicate that even then the Jewish community exercised control over its members with respect to almost all their affairs, business, social and civil, as well as religious, and vigorously punished its members for bringing controversies between each other before the non-Jewish courts, and there are traces of this also in the New York Portuguese Congregational records of the eighteenth century.

Naturally, Jews under heavy special disabilities stood little chance in the Middle Ages of just treatment at the hands of Christian judges, and it was almost the religious duty of the judges to reject Jewish evidence, if contradicted by the oath of a Christian, and the Jewish litigants were commonly unable even to speak the language of the land. In some important respects, however, expediency and a developed sense of justice caused them to modify their Jewish laws by an adoption of the law of the land, as, for instance, the general acceptance, about the year 1000 of the Christian era, in Germany and France, of Rabbi Gershom's prohibition of polygamy, which the Bible had countenanced, and prohibition of traffic in slaves. Moreover, as Israel Abrahams has well pointed out in his "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages," the extortionate levy of special Jewish taxes made the Jewish community dependent largely upon its wealthy members, and hence the old-time aristocracy of learn-

ing was superseded in large degree by an aristocracy of wealth.

Gradually, however, with the progress of civilization, Jewish disabilities were slowly removed, one after the other, in northern and western Europe, by special laws, and Mendelssohn's efforts to secure the adoption of the German language by the Jews of Germany, and thereafter the French Revolution, left only four or five important Jewish special branches of jurisdiction remaining for those countries, as citizenship conferred upon the Jews all civil rights under the law of the land while, as we will presently see, their progress in England and the United States had been greater and along different lines. Marriage, divorce, usury laws, the special Jewish oath and laws as to inheritance constituted the chief exceptions.

For continental Europe, Napoleon's famous "Assembly of Notables" of 1806 and the "French Sanhedrin" of 1807 are the great landmarks of our new era. Napoleon put to these assemblies, among other questions, his rhetorical question whether the French Jews constitute "a state within the state"—a question which is still of great importance even in our day—or acknowledge France as their country, feel bound to defend it, and bound to obey the laws of France. The question as to loyalty to their adopted country the delegates answered spontaneously, without waiting to frame the same in writing, by proclaiming their readiness to defend France until death, and they framed a declaration as to their relations to the law of the land which we can still accept implicitly, to wit, "that their religion makes it their duty to consider the law of the state as the supreme law in civil and political matters; that consequently, should their religious code, or its various interpretations, contain civil or political commands at variance with those of the French code, those commands would, of course, cease to influence and govern them, since they must, above all, acknowledge and obey the laws of the state." They also pronounced polygamy illegal for the Jews in Europe, recognized the control of the subject of divorce by the state, declared that Jewish law requires equality of treatment of their Christian brethren, and that it forbade usury in dealing with the Chris-

tians, too. (Tama: "Transactions of the Parisian Sanhedrin," translated by F. D. Kirwan; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Sanhedrin, French.")

In Eastern Europe, where the Jew is still under great disabilities, and protection by the law of the land is denied to him, Jewish jurisdiction is still comparatively extensive, but for Western Europe and the United States, the law of the land is supreme, and its sole apparent survival, religious solemnization of marriage, is recognized by the civil law itself. The abolition of the hateful Jewish oath, *More Judaico*, was strongly agitated by the Jews, and only the other day, it was adjudged superseded even in Roumania. Cremieux was one of the prime movers for its abolition in France, though, strangely enough, as late as 1870, in the Seymann case, he secured for clients, through a brilliant argument, a ruling of the French Court of Appeals that Algerian Jews are governed by the Jewish law as to inheritance of property, and not by the French, so that married daughters of a decedent who had received dowries, were not entitled to their share of their father's estate under the French law (see *Jewish Times*, Vol. II, pp. 585, 601). A somewhat similar attempt to graft on English law the customs of German Jews concerning grants to a daughter on her marriage of half a son's share failed already in 1750 in the case of *Franks vs. Adolphus* (1 Eden, 309, and 5 Brown's P. C., 151).

As the old-time special English Jewish laws had long since gone out of practice and been forgotten during the four centuries that the Jews had been banished from England, their resettlement in Cromwell's day was attended by enjoyment of substantially all the civil rights of the land, and there was no occasion to develop a special Jewish jurisdiction, though political rights were slower in acquisition. The relatively heavy Russian-Jewish migration of the past three decades into England, has, however, brought there many Jews, still familiar with, and attached to, special Jewish laws of Russia, particularly on the subject of divorce—as to which Russia recognizes exclusive Jewish jurisdiction—and the testimony of the late Chief Rabbi, of Israel Abrahams, and others, before a Royal Commission, against the legality of Rabbinical divorces in Eng-

land, which do not merely follow the decrees of the civil courts of England, aroused much opposition from such immigrant settlers. There is at present an effort at extension of Jewish jurisdiction on the part of the Russian Jews in England, which is an important factor in the selection of a new Chief Rabbi for that country, and Lord Rothschild, as chairman of a preliminary elective assembly, recently strongly combated the reactionary efforts, even from the orthodox Jewish point of view, at attempting to establish a "state within the state" for English Jewry.

As to the United States, special Jewish jurisdiction never had any excuse for existing and never made real headway. Under our federal Constitution, Jews and Christians were made equal before the law, and Jews ever fought for "the law of the land" and its protection, on the field of battle, at the polls, in the legislative assembly and from the bench and bar of courts of justice. The German and American Rabbinical Conferences voiced our views, in securing from the Jews, loyalty and law-abidingness to their beloved country and the law of the land. We in particular cherish our national achievements in securing absolute constitutional separation of Church and State, which David Dudley Field so beautifully described in the passage: "A nation of free men on this continent . . . first rent the shackles that priestly domination had been forging for centuries, and solemnly decreed that no man should dare intercept the radiance of the Almighty upon the human soul."

To-night is another landmark for us in this progress, when two of our own members, from different sections of the land, loyal to their faith, are being honored here upon their elevation to the federal bench, from which they will administer "the law of the land" in the name of our common country, to Jew and Christian alike, and without fear on the part of any one, that difference of race or creed will in any way influence their judgment; "one law shall be to him that is homeborn and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you" (Exodus XII, 49).

ISRAEL ABRAHAMS AT THE JUDÆANS *

MR. ABRAHAMS, in a response which was both graceful and witty, spoke of his gratification at finding himself so quickly and so much at home even after his short experience of America. He traced this to the similarity of conditions which meet modern Jews in all the countries of civilization who are each and all facing what he considers to be the true Jewish problem. Anti-Semitism, he believed, was dying away in Europe and he quoted as an instance of this the curious experience of a Christian student of Jewish literature whose works used to be purchased both by Jews and anti-Semites for purposes of defence and offence. His works were no longer being purchased in such large quantities, and the scholar in question, though a friend of the Jews, remarked sadly and quaintly to Mr. Abrahams, "anti-Semitism is no longer what it was." Yet anti-Semitism had brought into the modern Jewish consciousness the problem of the double life, which affects all Jews. They have to join in the life of the nations among whom they live, and yet at the same time preserve the sanctities of the Jewish life which they have inherited from their fathers.

"No condition will prevent the Jew from sharing the general life in which he lives. Share it he will and share it he must, I say. Anti-Semitism is on the wane in Germany, but no amount of anti-Semitism would prevent us Jews from sharing and contributing to our National life.

"Show your children the beauty of national life, and at the same time show them the beauty of the life within it. You cannot live without your American patriotism, but you will die without your Judaism. The curse falling upon us is the curse of vicariousness."

As an instance of such vicariousness, Mr. Abrahams re-

* Summary of an address delivered October 13, 1912, at a meeting in his honor. (From the *American Hebrew* of October 18, 1912.)

ferred to the officials of Jewish institutions in England who made elaborate regulations for ceremonies and festivals which they themselves did not observe. A similar problem arose between Jewish parents and Jewish children, and he quoted a profound remark of the late Miss Julia Richman, who said, "If you do not answer your children's questions about religion when they are young, you will be punished for it by their not asking questions when they grow older."

"If I had any message to deliver to you to-night," Mr. Abrahams said, "it would be this: There are as many different theories as to how the problem of the Jew living in an emancipated country can be solved, perhaps, as there are persons in this room, but we must put intellectual prejudices aside.

"We must begin the effort all over again, and not acquiesce in the assertion that Jewish life is incapable of being lived under emancipation."

It was the way of Jews, Mr. Abrahams said, to discuss the problems of Judaism as affecting all Jews but themselves. He added that it was a problem that would stand much discussion, and one that should be treated without recrimination and bitterness.

It was useless, Mr. Abrahams continued, to attempt to prevent Jewish children from joining freely in the life around them, however much the danger of assimilation might be feared. It reminded him of the experience of a friend of his who was brought up in the belief that if he looked at the Cohanims when they were blessing the people, he would lose his eyesight. This naturally made him intensely curious, and at last he closed one eye and ventured a peek at the priest, hoping to save the one and chancing the other. That would be the attitude of children towards the outer life if an attempt were made to keep them from it.

As regards the inner life of Jews, the modern difficulty was the want of sincerity among Jews as to their own religious feelings. He did not wish in that place to enter into disputed topics, but he was of the opinion that Liberal Judaism would help the modern Jew to be sincere with himself in his attitude towards the supreme problems of modern life.

RUPPIN'S "JEWS OF TO-DAY" *

BY DR. M. H. HARRIS

I

THE title of Dr. Arthur Ruppin's book is "The Jews of To-day." The burden of its message is, there will be no Jew to-morrow. The opening sentence reads, "The structure of Judaism, once so solid, is crumbling away before our very eyes." The entire volume of three hundred pages is an elaboration of that thesis. By way of contrast of the status of the Jew of the twentieth century, he gives us a brief survey of his status in the eighteenth. Then the Jew lived an isolated life, segregated in the ghetto. His entire education and culture consisted of the study of the Bible and the Talmud. Yet even these were not studied in the way to get their best spirit. Judaism applied, was a slavish fulfilment of ritual law tempered by Kabbalistic mysticism.

The development of commerce and industry did much to remove the barriers between Jew and Gentile. The political emancipation was further extended through the French Revolution. Since then, the disintegration has steadily set in. Following the favorite Rabbinical quadrilateral, Ruppin divides modern Jews into four groups, representing the different degrees of Jewish intensity. First, the larger half, untouched by modern culture, including most of the Jews living in Eastern Europe, Asia and Northern Africa. These have a tongue of their own, being either Yiddish or Spaniolish. This first group consists of about six million. The second group have given up some distinguishing externals in dress and manner, speak the language of their respective fatherlands, conform on the whole, to Jewish ritual, and show larger tolerance and interest in things not Jewish. Their children receive secular, as well as religious

* Paper read before the Judeans, January 4, 1914.

education. Most of these consist of emigrants from Eastern Europe and residents of Central Europe. They are estimated at about three million. The third group is marked by a growing disregard of the observances of Judaism, particularly of the Sabbath. They speak only the language of their respective fatherlands, and are not concerned with Jewish literature. They fulfill only the cardinal behests of the Jewish faith; they represent the well-to-do Jews in more advanced lands. They number about two million. The fourth group consists of those who have ceased to observe the tenets of our faith, who cling to their people, simply out of a sense of sentiment or honor. Conversions are frequent among them. They represent the wealthy Jews of the large towns and Jews with a university education in general. They number about one million.

In proportion then, as the Jew absorbs modern culture, is there a steady progress or regress through these classes, from the most observant toward the least.

The argument that this process unchecked, would ultimately lead to the disappearance of the Jew, Ruppin supports with historic analogies. He refers to the disappearance of the Hellenistic Jews, broadened by Greek culture. This instance is too exceptional to be used as a precedent. The disappearance of those of our brethren living in that part of the Diaspora, of which Alexandria was the centre, is bound up with the overthrow of the Jewish nationality and the rise of Christianity occurring at the same time. Let us not forget that Christianity was then a Jewish denomination. Nor do we know how many of these—like the lost Ten Tribes—may have drifted into other Jewish communities. The second instance is that of those Jews who adopted Arabic culture during the Moslem régime in Europe. But although he declares that Gabirol and Maimonides, its greatest products, were not Jewish in their teaching, have we not a right to say that their respective adoption of the Platonic and Aristotelean philosophies so saturated them with the Jewish spirit, that later generations accepted their works as the expression of Jewish law and belief? To the former, we owe one of the noblest prayers of our ritual. To the latter, the completest formulation of Jewish creed.

The Jew had hitherto resisted absorption by his surroundings, for the following reasons. First, by their exclusion from the Christian Trade Guilds. Secondly, by the wholesale expulsions into lands where the lower state of culture did not tempt their mergence with the new surroundings, as in Babylon in antiquity, in Poland and Turkey in the Middle Ages. The third element that has assured their continuity, has been their prolific growth. The greater percentage of Jewish births have helped to offset losses by other means. Then Dr. Ruppín proceeds to tell us that all of these saving causes are disappearing to-day.

It is true that our numbers are greater to-day than they ever were before. This he deduces from elaborate statistics, in which domain Dr. Ruppín is a master. The fact that the numbers of Jews have trebled in some lands within the last century shows how tremendously they must have lost in the past by persecution or other causes. He instances, for example, the great Jewish communities of China, Greece and Sicily of the olden times, that have now dwindled to small remnants. There have, it is true, been a few gains, through proselytism—the Falashas in Abyssinia, the Karaites in the Crimea (perhaps, descendants of the Chazars), the Bene Israel in Bombay, and the Black Jews in Cochin. But although the Jews to-day number nearly twelve million, or according to the London Year Book—thirteen million—they are spread now over so wide a world area as to impair the force of numbers. One hundred and fifty years ago, nearly all the Jews were in Poland. Half of them are there still. But the dispersion of Israel is growing by leaps and bounds. Fifty years ago there were not more than a hundred thousand Jews in English speaking lands. To-day, there are nearly three million, with the tendency in the ascendant. This wide scattering of Israel into small groups the world over, further aids their absorption by their surroundings. The old expulsions drove the Jews from lands that tempted mergence to those that rather repelled it. The new emigrations are reversing the process.

II

Let us now consider more in detail the further reasons given for the assimilation of the Jew in modern times. Let us call the first the commercial. This capitalistic era has completely changed the relations between Jew and Gentile. The despised money-lender of the eighteenth century has developed into the courted banker of the twentieth. None have profited so much as the Jews by the wondrous growth of commercialism, for they possess an inherited capacity for trade. Persecution of the Middle Ages did not create this propensity, it only intensified it. And in the hard struggle for life, the survival of the fittest has resulted in the scientific process of selection. But this capacity for business is not a mere greed for wealth, as it is mistakenly interpreted. It is a distinct intellectual force. It implies energy and daring, with the gift for swift comprehension and combination. And the same capacity that makes the Jew a first-class business man, also makes him an expert chess player and a technical inventor. For these reasons, the Jews have been able to create the new kind of emporium store, to father industrial combinations and syndicates. Furthermore, he says, that their excess of mental energy makes them feel the need of change and emotion, such as they find in trade, but not in labor.

For this reason, Jews have been most successful in those progressive lands marked by industrial and commercial advance, such as England, Germany, France, Italy and the United States, while, on the other hand, the Jews are poorest in the backward countries that have still not entered into the new industrialism, that would offer opportunity for his capacities. That is why in Odessa, for example, one-third of its one hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants are supported by charity, and why nine-tenths of the Russian Jews have a hard struggle to keep the wolf from the door—hence known as *luft-menschen*. This condition has further been fostered by Russia segregating her Jews within the Pale of Settlement and handicapping them with so many cruel and arbitrary restrictions. Ultimately, the author foresees that the modern commercialism will reach Eastern Europe and the Jews in those lands will attain the status of their

brethren in the West, a status founded on progressive capitalism.

But that which is aiding the Jew economically, is injuring the Jew religiously. It is meaning in the West, and it will mean in the East, a closer union with the Christian world, the secular education of the children, with everything tending to smooth the way toward assimilation.

Another reason given for Jewish preservation was their high birth-rate. But that, with growing prosperity, is steadily declining. Jews may be disconcerted at the information, that, with the exception of Algiers and Bucharest, the percentage of Jewish births is lower than that of other faiths; and they may be surprised to learn that Jews and Jewesses remain single to a greater extent than Christians. He further adds that the prevalent nervousness of the educated classes is prejudicial to the propagation of the species. This lower birth-rate, it is true, is partially counteracted by the lower death-rate of Jewry. The latter is due first, to the absence of drunkenness in the parents; secondly, to the better nurture even the poorest Jews give to the children; and third, to the self-sacrifice so beautifully marked in Jewish family life. Yet on the whole, the tendency is for a smaller increase of Jewish numbers in proportion, as they advance toward prosperity.

Emigration then, from the backward, restrictive East, toward the progressive and free West, awakens either gratification or alarm, accordingly as we view it, from the standpoints of economic security on the one hand, or spiritual decline on the other. As our brethren migrate from the Russian Pale and the backward Galicia and the less enlightened Orient, toward the highly civilized lands of Western Europe and North America, all the latent strength of Jewish intelligence is brought into play in the domain of commerce, which changes his status from poverty to prosperity, raises him politically and furthers his general enlightenment. Yet according to our author, these are all elements away from observance of Judaism, all tending to a lessening of Jewish consciousness. In these Western lands, the Jews congest in the large towns, which are commercially more highly developed and which offer opportunities for the professions of journalism, art and literature, toward which they feel an affinity. But large

towns are usually the centres of scepticism. That is where agnosticism flourishes. The unbelieving and the non-observing Jew in the great city is no longer singled out among his brethren for opprobrium. And so the numbers of unattached Jews in modern cities is steadily on the increase.

A separate language is also a preservative element whether it be Hebrew or Aramaic, as in Biblical and post-Biblical eras, or Yiddish and Spaniolish in the East of to-day. But close commercial relations between Jew and Gentile necessitates an acquisition of the modern languages by the former. That is the reason why Yiddish has disappeared from Germany to-day. The needs of commerce, more than Mendelssohn's translation of the Pentateuch then, induced the Jews to adopt the German tongue. To speak the languages of the Gentile means the next step, to adopt the education and the culture of the Gentile. In the eighteenth century the old theory prevailed that all knowledge required was in the Talmud. Not only was the education of the boys limited to this work given in the Cheder, but the education of the girls was disregarded, or we might almost say, religiously forbidden. It was hard at first, even to induce the parents to send the boys to the Baron de Hirsch schools in Galicia, although Hebrew was included in the curriculum. Denying education to girls has produced a peculiar result in Galicia, now that education is compulsory. The parents send the girls to the public Christian schools, but not the boys, so that the former are really better educated than the latter. It at times happens therefore, in many places, that the males speak Yiddish and the females Polish. The latter, therefore, out of touch with their brothers, drift into Christianity. It is true there are being established what I would call Jewish parochial schools, in which the modern branches of education are combined with the Jewish, but their number is steadily declining. Jews, with their innate love of learning, throng the universities. Discouraged by the low percentage of admission in Russia, they knock at the doors of the universities of Germany and France. The reason why many Jews of Eastern Europe renounce their faith is that they go from the ghetto to the Gymnasium. In the ghetto is still taught the Judaism of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with those limitations of

knowledge that prevailed in the Scholastic age before the advent of the Renaissance and Humanism. There is then a cultural gap of five hundred years. It is difficult for the Jew, once trained in the university, to bridge that gap. He is not only lost to orthodoxy, but to Judaism. The author points out that in Galicia, devotion to, and understanding of the Jewish tradition, decreases according to the school which the boy attends—the Cheder, the Hirsch Parochial School, the public school, the Gymnasium, or the University.

The author here hints at a happy solution, which it is rather a pity he does not develop. It is as follows: "If the modern school education could be imparted not only to a fraction, but simultaneously, to the whole of the young Jewish generation, the young generation would probably, wherever Jews were together in large numbers, develop a new character of its own and feel homogeneous." This would retard assimilation. Is not this desirable desideratum being reached in the populous Jewish communities of America to-day?

Basing his whole conception of the Jew's perpetuation on his segregation, he interprets the Jewish religion wholly from this standpoint and thus gives us a prosaic and disappointing picture. He declares at the outset that Judaism owes its strength, less to its metaphysical ideas than to its cult, i.e., its ceremonies and ritual. It was not the exalted teachings of the prophets, but Ezra and Nehemiah who assured its perpetuation by rigorously demanding total exclusion of outside influence and by disallowing any mixture of blood; in a word, isolation and race purity. He candidly declares that many ritual ordinances, particularly the dietary laws, cannot be defended on grounds of hygiene, but only become comprehensible when considered from the standpoint that they were designed to limit the intercourse of the Jew to his own people. So the Mezuzzah on the door-post was not, as we would like to feel, to remind him of the precepts of God, but rather to single him out for separation. He even goes so far as to quote that enemy of the Jews, Chamberlain, in endorsement of these views. He declares further that the majority of the religious injunctions had practical meaning in the days of Deuteronomy and Ezra, but had lost all living significance in Talmudic

and post-Talmudic ages, through changed conditions. But the justification of this complicated system of rules, lay only in their supposed divine origin. He realizes that Ezra's Reform in substituting the imposed authority of the law for the lofty conception of Prophetic religion, the religion of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah, is a set-back to religious progress. Nonetheless, he insists Israel has been saved by her ritual. However, this has helped to maintain the faith and has given a religious atmosphere to the life of the Orthodox Jew. He gives a religious aspect to his every deed, and very vividly feels the omnipresence of God. Even when the Jewish workmen of Russia organize a trade-union, it is associated with a religious service. We can see that Dr. Ruppín is not himself a believer, or he would not say words such as these: "We should call much, or perhaps most of his religious thoughts superstition, but who can draw the line between faith and superstition?" Even the institution of the *Yahrzeit*, he calls a development of ancestor worship. He further says, "the blind unquestioning faith of the Moslem and the Orthodox Jew (and he could have added the Catholic), setting at naught all the discoveries of modern science—this is a really important factor in the life of the people. Not the sceptical Protestantism of our own day, or the anæmic religious feeling of the enlightened Jew." And further, he says, "prayer is the essence of his religion, and it is because of this, that the Jew has still a strongly marked anthropomorphic conception of God." If we followed these conclusions of our author to their logical consequences, then religion would depend upon conceptions of life that modern knowledge has foresworn.

To possess a living faith then, one must shut his eyes to the truths revealed in the discoveries of modern research. What a dreadful anti-climax! We modern Jews, who insist that we can be enlightened and believing, should vigorously renounce such heresy. Naturally, he speaks contemptuously of Reform Judaism. He only knows its first negative post-Mendelssohn phase—more dignified externals, the introduction of the organ and the vernacular and a sermon in the language of the land. He ignores the second positive phase of Reform Judaism, that succeeded the school of Zunz and was fathered by Abraham Geiger,

The Reform that applied to religion—first, the principle of evolution and saw in the revelation of Divine Law not a finished product of one moment of time, but a growth, a development that is going on still. Second, as against this principle of aloofness from the world at large and indifference to its concerns, Reform Judaism preaches as one of its cardinal principles, a deep sense of responsibility toward the spiritual welfare of the human race. It subordinates ceremony to principle and gives woman new rights and duties in the synagogue. It is distinctly opposed to the non-religiousness of the neo-national Jew, of which our author is a pronounced type. He declares that an examination of the actual utility of ritual laws in the light of advancing scientific knowledge would be regarded by the Orthodox Jew as unheard-of sacrilege. How can he expect the youth of to-day, or let us rather say, the youth of to-morrow, to accept religion on such an arbitrary and mediæval proviso. Indeed, he acknowledges elsewhere in his book that this interpretation of their faith is still of that restricted era of enlightenment of the thirteenth century. No wonder, if the preservation of the Jew is to depend upon that mediæval mode of interpretation—no wonder that he sees the beginning of its dissolution.

Another reason given by this author for the disintegration of modern Jews and as a result of decline of faith, is the growth of intermarriage. We recognize with him that adherents of a religious minority are more liable to contract mixed marriages, when the choice is limited to their own coreligionists. This is demonstrated through a wealth of statistics, in the classification of which, Dr. Ruppín is an expert.

Then, we are next to consider the loss from our ranks by actual apostacy—also a consequence of religious scepticism. We well know how the sudden emergence of the Jews from the German ghetto into the broad intellectual domain, without possessing the political rights fitting them to their new life survey, did lead to a dreadful amount of apostacy in the post-Mendelssohn age, in the early years of the nineteenth century. But that mania for baptism soon subsided, with the extension of political rights and general emancipation. He acknowledges that the one hundred and twelve missionary societies for converting

the Jews to Christianity, which spent \$625,000 a year for this doubtful purpose, did only bring in a beggarly three hundred and eighty apostates each year.

The rise of anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria in the seventies and eighties, did act as a momentary check and re-awakened Jewish consciousness, but while it may have lessened intermarriages, Ruppin thinks it may have accelerated baptism.

III

Having exhaustively demonstrated his belief in the gradual disappearance of the Jew, Dr. Ruppin next faces the question, is Jewish preservation of value to the world; and enough to justify every effort to insure the Jews' continuity as a distinct people? This he abundantly proves. Dividing the races of the world into the three groups, white, yellow and black, the Jews come under the first group. Subdividing the white race into light and dark-haired, the Jew comes under the second subdivision. First, these black-haired whites are further grouped into three classes—those living in Arabia and North Africa, the old Assyrians and Babylonians and the modern Arabians; second, those settled in Western and Southern Asia, the old Hittites and the modern Armenians and Persians, as examples; third, those resident in South Europe, of which the Greek are singled out as example. The Jew does not, as had been hitherto supposed, belong to the first of these three divisions, the Semitic, though he gets his language from them. He is more closely allied to the second and is therefore in more immediate race kinship with Armenians and Persians. This entirely upsets the anti-Semitic crusade directed in the eighties against the Jew. For Ruppin cites the great authority Zollschan, to prove that the Jews are not Semitic, after all. In spite of occasional accretions from other racial groups, he considers the Jew to-day, on the whole, a remarkably pure race.

Now to consider the question of his value to the world. He demonstrates through elaborate statistical tables, while the Jew may be less prolific in the production of genius, he produces men of talent to a superabundant degree. His very isola-

tion has strengthened his intellectual gifts. And considering that he has been shut out of the world's culture for five hundred years, his achievements are all the more remarkable. He first answers the question, is the Jew inferior ethically, which is sometimes asserted by our adversaries. Without attempting to make the claim of ethical superiority, which I think he well might, and he would be aided by statistics there, he is moderately content to prove the Jew is not ethically inferior. Why, he asks, are Jews sometimes guilty of crimes in the domain of commerce? Simply, he answers, because their chief activities are in the domain of commerce. Therefore, it will be found that the criminals of any racial group demonstrate their criminality in that sphere of life in which their activity is exercised. That is the reason why, of Jews engaged in business, the black sheep in their midst are usually guilty of fraud and deceit, while among the Gentiles more largely engaged in manual labor, their degenerates are usually guilty of crimes exhibiting violence and brutality.

Specifying now more in detail their distinct cultural value in the world of to-day, first, he points out that which they lack, due to their exclusion from the world's growth from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century. In the Jewish education, he finds absent the plastic arts, the refinements of life, the love of nature, European literature and science. He finds however, the Jew possesses in a distinct degree, a wealth of ideas, the qualities of moderation, abhorrence of violence or lust, sympathy with sorrow, industry, the domestic virtues, a sense of democratic equality, religiousness, idealism. That which is significant to us in this summary, is the very slight place given to religion in the Jew's spiritual assets. That is exactly the attitude of the modern neo-nationalist, whose exponent Ruppín certainly is. The Jew is of value to the world then, because of his general culture, of which religiousness may be one feature, that is all. He believes in the Jew rather than in Judaism. He is significantly silent about any mission of the Jew, as the witnesses of God to bring light to the Gentile, silent as to the Jew's preservation to bring a religious message to mankind.

Accepting then, our author's standpoint, this valuable racial group is likely to be lost to the world for the reasons so far

given. First, through modern secular education founded on natural science and evolution, which he calls anti-religious, though we would call it opposed only to religion in its ancient acceptance. The second disintegrating element, in his opinion, is that modern education is imparted to the Jew in a foreign language and not in his own Yiddish. Third, educated in Gentile schools, there is no recognition of his own religious traditions, though the institutes of the Church are recognized, to some extent, in secular schools, in all lands. Lastly, he is too closely interrelated with the Gentile world in industrial and commercial life. The only salvation, then, according to Dr. Ruppín, would be for the Jew to have his own schools, in which general branches of education could be taught, in addition to distinctively Jewish teaching, and secondly, to be imparted in a Jewish tongue, either Yiddish or Hebrew. Third, that the adult Jew be placed in such surroundings that he would not be dependent for his economic life upon the Gentile surroundings, that is, that he live again a segregated life. All these suggestions are summarized in the one solution, really the climax of this book—the establishment of a Jewish nationality.

A territory of his own would mean that the Jew would be able to live a completely independent, economic life, that he would be both a consumer and a producer, and primarily, that he should take up that calling, from which he has been estranged for so many centuries—agriculture. Recent attempts have been made to cultivate husbandry among the Jews. The number of those engaged in farming in Russia, where the largest agricultural colonies are, is sixty-eight thousand. The more recently organized farm colonies in the United States number twenty thousand. The Baron de Hirsch colonies established in the Argentine Republic, number fifteen thousand souls and the farm colonies of Palestine, originally started as benevolent projects by Edmund de Rothschild, number six thousand. This represents nearly twelve thousand families and not a hundred thousand souls. Though smallest in number at present, it is to Palestine that Dr. Ruppín directs his eyes as the best land for the establishment of Jewish agricultural centres in the future. For only here is the environment favorable for a revival of his own

tongue. Hebrew is becoming a living language in Palestine. It is, then, in Palestine that Dr. Ruppitt centres his hopes for the future of the Jew and Judaism. He first considers the possibility of establishing a Jewish centre in Eastern Europe, but he well points out that its future maintenance, dependent on the caprice of the powers, would be too uncertain. Then again, he would be so close to the economic life of his surroundings, that he would soon again be caught in its toils, with the same assimilative results as already outlined. He takes up the Territorial project of Israel Zangwill, but rehearses the difficulty so far encountered, of finding a suitable territory—the pastures of East Africa, Mesopotamia, Angola. Palestine has many of the desired requirements. On the whole, a favorable Turkish government, a healthy climate, a fairly civilized settlement, with an environment not too cultured to tempt the Jew to merge with it. Who can say, but what from the small beginnings, there might develop, according to our author, a national restoration, such as was witnessed in Judæa, through the grant of Cyrus, the Persian, twenty-five hundred years ago?

This brings our author to the project of Zionism. The desire to return to the land of his fathers, an article of creed in the Orthodox liturgy, has been a fluctuating aspiration dependent on his external circumstances. Therefore, we find a Messianic movement arising in Europe in different periods of oppression. In the eighties, an organization was formed, known as the Lovers of Zion, though the world did not take much notice of it. Not till 1897, when Theodore Herzl, moved to action by the persistent persecutions of Russia and Roumania and the anti-Semitism of Germany and Austria, called a Congress of Jews to obtain a legally assured home for the Jewish people in Palestine, was what is known as Zionism really born. Though its chief supporters still come from Russia, and anti-Semitism was its powerful incentive, nonetheless, it has become a world-movement, a new bond of union. It has awakened confidence in the doubting, has stirred Jewish yearnings in many estranged from the synagogue, and has brought East and West in closer contact. It has very much changed its program since its first inception. Its claims are to-day more modest, and for that very reason, it

has disarmed many of its quondam opponents. Under its encouragement, Jews are beginning to settle in Palestine as colonists, even if they cannot come, as was at first supposed, as rightful possessors of a land that was to be their own.

Our author is honest enough to realize that the outlook is not particularly encouraging. He faces the tremendous difficulty of inducing Jews to settle in a country that offers no economic inducement, that implies a complete change in mode of life and taking up of a new occupation—agriculture. The difficult cereal cultivation is only likely to be faced by youth or by those already accustomed to husbandry. But the easier tree-culture might be undertaken by the mature. Still, in the course of thirty years from the time when the first colony was established, only thirty thousand souls have settled there. In that time, nearly two million have emigrated to the United States. Most of the settlers will come in fact, in the future, from Eastern lands, though they represent a lower culture. He also recognizes the fact that different groups of Jews from diverse countries speaking different languages, are likely to clash. At best, even by intensive cultivation, he recognizes that it could never accommodate more than two million, though there are thirteen million Jews in the world to-day and the number is increasing. But according to his own confession, even with the greater stimulation toward Palestinian settlement since the Zionistic movement, the gathering of so large a number would take ever so many generations. Finally, the author bluntly declares, that religion alone is not strong enough to save the Jews in the Diaspora from extinction. But he says, if there come from Palestine reports of a new Jewish life growing up there, with Jewish schools teaching its faith, the Hebrew language a living tongue, a rebirth of poetry, art and music—that surely must command the sympathy and support of those Jews who would never have been won over by theoretical propaganda.

To such statement we are compelled to reply, that if religion at hand, is not going to save the Western Jew from extinction, he is hardly likely to be saved by a report of a flourishing Jewish colony in the distance. No right-minded Jew will look with anything but sympathy toward the attempt of some of his

brethren to re-establish a Jewish national centre. There may be non-Zionists, but there hardly need be anti-Zionists. For all Jews as such to form a nationality, whether together or scattered, is one thing, but for a group of Jews to organize a nation is another. We may even go so far as to say that the establishment of just such a national centre might give new dignity and confidence to the Jews at large. There is no reason why a group of Jews should not have a land of their own, when we consider that though all Christians do not form one nationality, the Church has half a dozen nationalities, each expressing a distinct phase of the faith—Episcopalianism in England, Lutheranism in Germany, Roman Catholicism in Italy, Presbyterianism in Scotland and the Greek Church in Russia. But while we cannot entertain the optimistic expectation of Dr. Ruppín as to the outcome of the Palestine experiment, neither on the other hand, do we share his pessimistic prognostication, summarized in the words: "Zionism is the last desperate stand of the Jew against annihilation." Let us not forget what terrific storms the bark of Jewry has hitherto weathered. If history has taught us anything, it is how often indifference has brought its own corrective. We see it in the religious awakening of the pre-Maccabæan Hellenists in antiquity and in the rousing of the Jewish consciousness of people like Cremieux, Emma Lazarus and Theodore Herzl in modern times. Who would have supposed, after the overthrow of the nation in the year seventy, that a new era should begin for the Jew in Europe, unaided by any friendly monarch like Alexander the Great, or Cyrus the Persian? Who would have supposed, when bigotry was closing the toils around the Jew of the fifteenth century, that Turkey's conquest of the Byzantine Empire would open to them a new door for the assurance of their continuity? Who would have supposed, at the very moment of the Spanish expulsion, that exploration would discover a new continent, later to become a place of Jewish settlement? Aye, in the memory of living persons, who would have expected that the enforcing of the savage May Laws in the Russian Pale of Settlement in 1882, that roused such a cry of woe, would have ultimately resulted in the transplanting of two million Jews from Slavdom to the United States, with a great

religious, as well as a great commercial, opportunity? Who can say what surprises await the Jew of to-morrow, still in the womb of history? We recognize that it is easier to withstand persecution than emancipation, but persecution is not an unmixed good, nor liberty an unmixed evil. We believe that through his inherited intellectual gifts, which his religion has so largely fostered, the Jew has yet a great religious message for mankind. And just so long as he will be able to voice that message, just so long will his epitaph remain unwritten.

SCHNITZLER'S "PROFESSOR BERNHARDI" *

BY BERNARD NAUMBURG

ARTHUR SCHNITZLER, author of "Professor Bernhardi," born in Vienna, May 15, 1862, of Jewish ancestry, is one of the leading living Austrian dramatists. He ranks high also as a poet, novelist and humorist, and is one of the few Austrians who have obtained that greatest distinction for the German dramatist, the Grillparzer prize.

For three generations his family has been prominent in medical activity in Vienna. His grandfather was a well known physician and medical writer. His father, Dr. Johann Schnitzler, a famous laryngologist, was professor at the University, consulting physician of the Polyclinic, editor of the *Wiener Medizinische Presse*, founder, and until his death in 1893, director of an important medical institution. Arthur Schnitzler, himself, is a physician of no mean ability. Until his thirtieth year he devoted himself entirely to the practice of medicine. Since that time he has given himself to literature.

He has aptly been called the "Austrian de Maupassant." Like the French writer, he has shown the tragedy of the improper sex-relationship with its fatality for woman. Just as his training and experience as a physician have fitted him to portray the psychology of sex, his skill as a diagnostician has enabled him to depict the types of the modern Viennese Jew in his novel, "Der Weg ins Freie," and in his comedy, "Professor Bernhardi."

This drama, first produced in Vienna at a private reading in November, 1912, has been thought to portray incidents in the life of the author's father. In a letter to George Brandes, pub-

* Address delivered before the Jewsans on May 10, 1914.

lished in the review *Der Merkur*, Dr. Schnitzler writes in substance:

"The play does not represent my father's experience, although he did found a hospital similar to the Elisabethinum, in spite of opposition and hostility. Though my father experienced ingratitude and antagonism during his later years, he was never ousted from his post as director of the hospital. My comedy has no other truth than this: *It could have happened in Vienna at the end of the last century.*"

The production of the drama was forbidden in Austria. It has been played, however, with much success in Germany. Within the last few months it has been excellently produced in New York City.

The action occurs in Vienna in 1900. In regard to political and social conditions in Vienna at that time, the anti-Semitic party had been in undisputed control of the municipal government since 1896. To this régime the Emperor had capitulated, and the conquest of the city had been speedily followed by a no less striking conquest of the Landtag (Parliament) of Lower Austria.

Professor Bernhardi, the hero, is an eminent Viennese physician, who numbers even royalty among his patients. Racially, he is a Jew. Although he has not been baptized, he does not appear actively to profess his faith. Primarily, he is a man of science, concerned neither with the political nor the religious life about him.

He is the founder of the Elisabethinum, a private hospital which has become famous both for the efficiency of its medical staff and for its excellent research work. Bernhardi is its chief directing physician and head of the Department of Internal Medicine.

The other *dramatis personæ* are thirteen physicians, Minister Flint and Privy Councillor Winkler, both officers of the Department of Education, Father Reder the priest, a lawyer, a reporter, and Sister Ludmilla, a hospital nurse, who is the only woman in the play.

The drama opens in the ante-room of the medical ward of the hospital. A young girl is dying from septicemia, as the

result of a criminal operation. In her last moments in a state of euphoria, she believes she has recovered and that she will soon be permitted to leave the hospital, to be joined by her lover and return to the joy of life. Sister Ludmilla, an ardent Catholic, has summoned Father Reder to administer the last sacrament. Professor Bernhardi, not wishing to dispel the girl's hallucinations of happiness by a realization of her approaching end, as head of the hospital, forbids the priest's entrance to the death-chamber. While they are parleying, the girl dies. Bernhardi speaks:

"Erschrecken Sie nicht, Hochwürden. Ihre Schuld ist es nicht. Sie wollten nur Ihre Pflicht erfüllen. Ich wollte es auch. Dass es mir nicht geglückt ist, tut mir leid genug.

The Priest.

Nicht sie, Herr Professor, sind es, der mir Absolution zu erteilen hat. Dass arme Geschöpf da drin ist als Sünderin und ohne die Tröstungen der Religion dahingegangen. Und das ist Ihre Schuld.

Bernhardi

Ich nehme sie auf mich.

Priest.

Es wird sich noch erweisen, Herr Professor, ob Sie das im stande sein werden."

Hitherto Jew and Christian had worked hand in hand for the glory of the hospital.

Now Dr. Ebenwald, a Christian, Vice-Director of the hospital, and head of the Department of Surgery, sees his opportunity to succeed Bernhardi as Chief Physician. Ebenwald's aim is to substitute Christian for Jew in the hospital administration. The forces of Church, State and Society are employed for his purpose.

In conference with his friends, Bernhardi decides to make an explanation to the Church. This he is prepared to read at the next meeting of the Executive Board of the hospital.

Bernhardi is then informed by Ebenwald that the Clerical party has begun a Parliamentary investigation to be referred to the Minister of Education. Ebenwald offers to muzzle the investigation, if Bernhardi will cast his deciding vote at the Board meeting for the Christian candidate as head of the Department of Dermatology. Bernhardi is firmly convinced that the Jewish

candidate is the better man. He refuses to have his vote influenced and charges Ebenwald with corruption.

At the request of Doctor Flint, Minister of Education, who is a former colleague and friend of Bernhardi, the latter promises to give a full written explanation of the episode, to be used by Flint to quash the Parliamentary investigation.

The third act is a meeting of the Executive Board of the hospital. The Jewish candidate has been elected. Bernhardi appears. The Board is divided in his support. A Jew and an apostate Jew are against him; several Christians, though not approving his actions, are loyal to their chief.

On account of the resignation of the Lay Board of Directors and on account of the Parliamentary investigation, the future of the hospital is threatened. Ebenwald moves that Bernhardi be deposed as director. He gives as his reasons the fact that public dissatisfaction has been aroused, because a hospital, in which eighty-five per cent. of the patients are Christians, is administered by a medical staff preponderatingly Jewish. Before the motion is put, Bernhardi resigns.

A criminal proceeding against Bernhardi is instituted on the testimony of Sister Ludmilla, of one of the Jewish physicians, and of a Christian candidate for a medical degree, all supporters of Ebenwald. He is convicted of the statutory offence of insulting the established Church.

Even though Father Reder has exonerated him from intended personal assault, he is sentenced to two months' imprisonment. This carries with it his professional degradation. So strong is the anti-Semitic feeling that not even the explanation of the priest can appease the public hysteria.

Again Father Reder and Bernhardi meet. It is immediately after the trial, at the house of the physician. The priest has called to express his admiration for the physician's independent attitude. He condones his own action in prosecuting the affair. He says that while he may admire the personal attitude of the physician, it is his duty as representative of the Church to uphold her dignity, position and power by publicly prosecuting anyone who, in the slightest degree, infringes upon her prerogatives. Bernhardi regrets that the priest must subordinate his

personal knowledge of the truth to the demands of his Church. Father Reder accuses Bernhardi of uncontrollable antipathy and enmity towards his cloth and all that it signifies. Bernhardi's response is non-committal. But they part as friends.

At the time of the fifth act Bernhardi has served his sentence and has just been released. Hofrat Winkler is a typical Austrian diplomat, clever, able, tactful, vacillating in his ideals. He is a friend of Bernhardi and had been one of the lay directors of the hospital. The act opens in his office in the Department of Education.

In Dr. Feuermann, a Jewish physician employed by the Government in a rural district, Schnitzler shows us a strong contrast to Bernhardi. Through his lack of skill, Feuermann has committed malpractice and caused the death of a female patient. Although exonerated by a board of medical judges, he applies to the Minister of Education to change his residence, because his old district will have none of him. It is interesting to note the tolerance and sympathy displayed by the Christian Board towards the inefficient Jewish physician.

Then Bernhardi comes to the Ministry, ostensibly to apply for a restoration of his rights and privileges as a physician, in reality to face his former friend, Minister Flint, who has sacrificed his old friendship for personal political ambition and party expediency.

In view of Flint's promise to aid in making the hospital a state institution Bernhardi resolves to prosecute no further. He knows, and is indifferent to, the fact that the nurse has confessed that her testimony against him was perjured.

The play ends in an anti-climax. Bernhardi admits that he was only actuated by what he considered the right thing to do in the specific case, and in no way considers himself a reformer. Hofrat Winkler in conclusion replies that the Professor has been making a fool of himself.

At the time of the action of the play, anti-Semitic feeling was so strong in Vienna that it made itself distinctly felt among scientific men. Medical students are reported to have rioted in protest against receiving lectures from Jewish professors. Every opportunity was taken to displace the unbaptized Jew.

In 1908 a fair-minded Viennese Christian, Camilla Theimer, interested in the solution of the problem, wrote in her "Anti-Semitismus und National Judenthum":

"The government appoints only a small number of Jews as University teachers. The Christian students take every opportunity to drive their Jewish colleagues from the University. The assertion is made that we have too many Jewish physicians and lawyers, not only relatively in proportion to the Jewish population, but actually numerically."

Camilla Theimer refers to the Doctor Feuermann type of inefficient physicians, who, she says, are more to be pitied than condemned. She finds the reason for the seemingly large number of mal-practitioners among Jews to be the fact "that every Jewish workman wants his son to be a professional man." Owing to this condition many Jewish physicians and lawyers, eminent not only as men but also as intellectual leaders, are ignored. Theodor Herzl has said: "The strong nations are judged by their best sons, the weak by their worst." It is about time for the Jews to be judged by their finest representatives.

Camilla Theimer explains: "The modern Jew wants to live with the Christian. The Christian only thinks of the Jew as living alongside of him. Modern anti-Semitism is the natural consequence of this fundamental error of the Jew to force himself upon the Christian."

To cite Schnitzler's own words in "Der Weg ins Freie":

"Glauben sie dass es einen Christen auf Erden gibt, und wäre es der edelste und gerechteste und treueste, einen einzigen, der nicht in irgend eines Augenblick des Grolles, des Unmuts, des Zorns selbst gegen seinen besten Freund, gegen seine Geliebte, gegen seine Frau, wenn sie Jüdin ist, oder Jüdischer Abkunft waren, deren Judentum innerlich wenigstens ausgespielt hatte? Diese tragische Wahrheit ist ein trauriges Denkmal unserer Zeit."

In this novel, relentless irony is visited upon the Jews for their supposed cold and selfish intellectualism and lack of real emotional depth.

It is difficult to ascertain Schnitzler's personal attitude towards Judaism. In "Der Weg ins Freie" he blames Jewish

heritage for the self-divided brooding nature that can never be naïve.

According to Dr. Bloch of the *Oesterreichische Wochenschrift*, Dr. Zollschan says that the European Jew who has had three generations of culture will free himself from the yoke of Judaism. This is not the case, says Dr. Bloch, with Arthur Schnitzler. His allegiance has been and is so unshakable that even when the temptation arose for his passing over at the time of a deep and tragic emotional crisis, he withstood it.

And how does Bernhardi impress us? Is he representative of the highest type of intellectual Jew?

Bernhardi's sense of justice, his singleness of purpose and his high standard of professional ethics, combined with the simplicity and modesty of his character, stand out in strong contrast to the selfish opportunism and vacillation of Flint, and the low professional standards and political duplicity of Ebenwald. But Bernhardi's impatience, arrogance and stubbornness are the serious defects of his character.

While he possesses certain fine qualities characteristic of the Jewish race, he is actuated primarily by the point of view of the physician. As a physician he regards it as his single duty to ease the last hours of the dying. In the performance of this duty he forgets that others may be actuated by a religious sense, which to them is equally important and sacred. Had Bernhardi been the finest type of Jewish gentleman, he would not have shown lack of consideration for the religious feelings of others. Father Reder acted completely within his rights. The dying girl was entitled to aid and should have been allowed to receive the benefits of the religious sacrament in which she and her people believed.

Bernhardi was also weak in allowing his resentment at Ebenwald's corrupt proposal, to prevent his offering an explanation which he genuinely wished to give, until mastered by his personal feelings.

As a work of art the play is a splendid creation. It is a well-portrayed picture of the Zeit-geist. The characters are well defined. The action belongs to the region of thought and

is thoroughly maintained. It is rich in humor and pathos. But, in my opinion, the play has created and will continue to create the wrong impression of Jewish character, feeling and tact.

As Lessing's genius gave to the world a Nathan der Weise, may we not hope that Schnitzler's creative power will, in the future, produce a modern Nathan, an exemplar of the best type of modern Jew?

THE JEW AS A CITIZEN OF ENGLAND *

BY DR. DAVID DE SOLA POOL

IF you will be kind enough to regard the preceding speaker's beautiful and patriotic address as the introduction to my address, I may possibly succeed in dealing with "The Jew as a Citizen of England" in ten minutes. Yet the task you set me is not an easy one because of the great variety and the many shades of Jewish citizenship in England.

There are Jewish super-citizens, such as Sir Francis Montefiore, a citizen *à outrance*, whose perfervid English patriotism restrains him from aiding destitute or starving Jews of German or Austrian birth lest his English patriotism become suspect. Through the same sensitiveness of feverish patriotism he has recently resigned from the international Zionist organization, not because he has lost sympathy with Zionism, but because there are Jews of German or Austrian birth in the Zionist organization.

Even so ardent an English patriot as this gentleman never before felt any difficulty in reconciling an ultra-English patriotism with loyalty to Zion, any more than have the other English Zionists, who are, in truth, in large measure the young intellectual leaders of Anglo-Jewry as contrasted with, and often opposed to, the older financial leaders. Col. Goldsmid, one of the pioneer Zionists in England, was by profession an officer in the British army. Leon Simon and Norman Bentwich, two of the young guiding thinkers of Zionism in England, are both government officials. Was not Joseph Chamberlain's unique offer of a tract of land in British East Africa made to English Zionists? English patriotism has never clashed with Zionism or Judaism, any more than has Zionism or Judaism been in conflict with English patriotism.

* Address delivered December 6, 1914.

The reason for this is simple. The English Jew sets his Judaism and his civic loyalty in harmonious perspective. He does not adopt a painful mental squint in the effort to see them both on the same plane. When he sees England declaring war on the Jewish nation he will know that the planes have met in conflict. But until that time he lives with his Jewish and his English patriotism in happy agreement. He lives at peace in multiple loyalty to his wife, his family, his *shool*, his city, his country, his king and his God, blissfully free from the strabismic loyalty of a Sir Francis Montefiore which jumbles these loyalties of varying references and various planes into conflict.

So far as one may venture to improve on Burke and sum up a whole people, it may be said that the civic characteristic of the English Jew of the nineteenth century was this perfect harmony between his Jewishness and his English citizenship. Unlike his brethren in other countries, when he fought for his political rights, he did so without the flabby tergiversation of claiming them solely as a citizen. He claimed them frankly and outspokenly as a Jew. While we Jews in America fought on the Russian passport question solely on American and not on Jewish grounds, the struggle for Jewish rights in England, which was waged between 1831 and 1860, was fought not on English but on Jewish grounds. In 1847 Baron Lionel de Rothschild was elected to Parliament by the city of London. He presented himself at the bar of the House, refused to take the oath over both Testaments bound together, and refused to take the oath at all, so long as its final words were "on the true faith of a Christian." Not being allowed to take the oath in any other form, he could not take his seat. He resigned, stood for re-election and was again returned by his constituency. This time he was offered the Old Testament alone and he took the oath, but omitted the words "on the true faith of a Christian." Once again he was not allowed to take his seat. Then Sir David Salomons was elected to Parliament to represent Greenwich and he also refused to take the oath with its Christian ending. He was excluded from the House, but later returned, took his seat, spoke on his case, and took part in three divisions on it, but in the end he was removed by the Sergeant-at-Arms. He was fined

fifteen hundred pounds for thus representing his constituency without having taken the requisite oath. Finally in 1858, after an amendment of the law, Baron Lionel de Rothschild took his seat in Parliament, taking the oath with covered head and omitting the Jewishly objectionable words.

This same spirit, characteristic of Anglo-Jewish citizenship, was shown by a few Jewish ladies who received an invitation from King Edward VII to attend one of his Friday evening levees, when they replied with the request that they be excused from attending because Friday evening was their Sabbath. This spirit was again exemplified when the late Chief Rabbi, Herman Adler, was similarly invited to attend one of the King's levees on a Friday evening. He begged to be excused, and the characteristic answer which fearless and honorable self-respect calls forth was given when King Edward, in consideration for this one guest, changed the date of the reception from Friday to Thursday.

Because of this spirit the Jew in England is trusted and respected. To his own self he is true. Though the snob who is ever with us will purchase social advancement by apostasy, the English Jew, unlike his brethren in some other lands, has not purchased civic advancement by Jewish disloyalty. Lord Swaythling, while a member of the blue blooded and aristocratic House of Peers, was the organizer of small East End congregations and Chairman of the Shechitah Board. The only Jew of English birth in public life to be reviled and taunted for being a Jew was Disraeli—and he was a baptized Christian. English Jews of the type of Sir Moses Montefiore, Sir George Jessel, Sir Matthew Nathan or Lord Reading have not nervously overworked their English patriotism. They have instinctively felt the truth underlying Dr. Johnson's caustic remark, that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

It is therefore not for me to detract from the patriotism of the English Jews or to cheapen it by detailing a list of the honors or titles which have been or are held by English Jews, or by giving you the proportion of the Jews in England who have served in the Boer War, or who are serving in this tragic conflict. I would scorn to cast an indignity on the citizenship of

men like Baron Lionel de Rothschild, Sir David Salomons, Sir Moses Montefiore, Lord Swaythling and upon Anglo-Jewry in general by any defense of their loyalty. Such a defense or panegyric could only breathe the breath of suspicion on their simple, natural, unquestioning, inevitable, characteristic combination of loyalty to Judaism, to Jewry and to England.

THE JEW AS A CITIZEN IN THE COUNTRY OF HIS DOMICILE — FRANCE *

By S. M. STROOCK

I HAVE observed that there has been some criticism of the use of the word "domicile" in our text, and having no inclination to enter the field of controversy upon the limitations of the meaning of this word, I claim the lawyer's privilege of applying to the text the "rule of reason" and of reading out of it whatever is surplusage. I have therefore seen fit to delete the words "in the country of his domicile," and to read my text, "The Jew as a *Citizen in France*," for by the use of the word "citizen" I understand that we mean a man who has all of the rights, franchises and privileges of a freeman and of a member of the nation in whose country he has made his home.

In preparing this brief paper I have tried to be catholic, and I have drawn my material from both friendly and unfriendly sources. I shall not attempt anything except to state the facts as I understand them.

We have no exact knowledge of the number of Jews in France. Various estimates have been made, ranging from 100,000 to 300,000, but the most reliable information which we have seems to indicate that there are not more than 100,000 Jews in France, out of a total population of over 39,000,000, that is about one-quarter of one per cent. In other words, there are ten Jews in the City of New York to one Jew in all France, and of the 100,000 Jews in France, 60,000 of them reside in Paris. When we consider further that there are some fairly reliable statistics to the effect that 60,000 Jews immigrated into France from Russia during the period commencing with the

* Address delivered December 6, 1914.

Pogroms of 1881, we see that we have a comparatively small number of Jews who have been French citizens for any appreciable length of time. Of course, our statistics are unreliable, because nothing approaching a census of the Jews has ever been attempted to be made in France, and we are further embarrassed by the fact that a great many Jews in France have sometimes with reason, and sometimes without any reason whatsoever, changed their names, possibly in an effort to lose their identity. M. Klein became M. Petit; M. Wolf became M. LeLoup, and such common French names as DuPont, Durand and DuBois have been adopted by a number of Jews.

If we were to judge the Jew as a citizen of France by the number of distinguished Jews, who in almost every walk of life have demonstrated their superior ability, we would feel justified in at once concluding that the Jew as a citizen in France has brought honor and fame, not only to his co-religionists, but also to the country where he has made his home. Six Jews have been Cabinet Ministers in France, and among these the names of Crémieux, Millaud, Raynal and Klotz shine with splendor, and if we are also to claim Gambetta as a Jew, we may well say that scarcely any more distinguished names appear in French history. In music, in classical philology, in Oriental languages and literature, in astronomy and science, in jurisprudence, in medicine, in philosophy, in sculpture, in painting, in engineering, in literature and journalism, in the drama, and among actors and actresses, there are no names in France more distinguished than those of Jews. Every year a list is published of the number of persons appointed by the government who bear the title *Conseillers Du Commerce Extérieur de La France*, who are appointed to watch over French interests abroad, and no less than eighty-two Jewish names appear annually upon this list. As one anti-Semitic writer has sneeringly phrased it, "The Institute of France and Parliament each contains a *Minyan* of Jews." They are found in the administration of the public funds. To the army they have contributed Lieutenant-Generals, Brigadier-Generals, Colonels, Lieutenant-Colonels, Majors and Captains; to the navy they have contributed distinguished naval constructors and heads of the ordnance de-

partment. Upon the bench they have been represented by no less than one hundred and ten judges. In the Department of Education there have been over two hundred professors of faculties and a number of inspectors general of public instruction; while as regards the press, there is scarcely a French journal (excluding the anti-Semitic press) which has not from one to a dozen Jews upon its editorial staff. As builders of railroads and in every branch of commerce, among the leaders there have been many distinguished Jews.

But from this roster, brilliant as it is, we must not come to too speedy a conclusion, for we are too well aware that other countries which it may not be necessary to name, have produced a number of men who have accomplished great things in science, in art and in literature, and yet the countries in which they have made their homes cannot be regarded as more than semi-civilized. When, however, we remember the comparatively small number of Jews in France, we are filled with wonder and admiration when we read of the great distinction attained by so many of them.

It is the people as a whole which give character to a country; and from the people as a whole, guided by the achievements of its great men, we are enabled to judge that country in the light of civilization. We may not all agree that the voice of the people is the voice of God, but I think we shall have no difficulty in agreeing that the voice of the people is the voice of the country in which they live.

Our enemies admit that the effect of emancipation and modern education in France has been elevating and fructifying, so far as individual Jews are concerned, but they have no hesitancy at the same time in proclaiming that the effect upon Jewry as a whole has been disintegrating.

Who and what is the Jew in France as a citizen? We must keep in mind that after the dispersion, the Jews were in a very real sense a people without a country, and bearing this in mind we must also remember that the Jews who first entered France, as well as the more recent immigrants into France, came there, not for the purpose of changing their country, but in search of a country, and from the outset they were ready and willing to

and did proclaim to the people of the Fatherland which gave them a home, like Ruth of old, "Thy People shall be my People." In Provence and Venaissin we find that the Jews lived uninterruptedly on French soil for centuries previous to the Normans, and that with regard to age, as Leroy-Beaulieu has well put it, "they may boast of being among the most French of Frenchmen, the most native of natives." In the southwest of France we find that the Jews settled on the banks of the Gironde and the Adour in the time of the Valois, and that the Jews of Bordeaux settled there over three hundred and fifty years ago and have continuously made France their home.

To France we shall ever remain indebted for the gift of civil liberty. Inspired by the example of our own beloved country, France was the first country in Europe to confer upon Jews the rights of citizenship, the rights of freemen. It was the French Revolution which struck from them the shackles and endowed them with the rights of human beings. Commercial disabilities under which the Jews of Alsace suffered were removed as early as 1780, but it was not until 1789 that the National Assembly accorded them freedom of religious worship, due to the powerful advocacy of Mirabeau and Abbé Grégoire. Talleyrand it was who in 1791, only a few days before the dissolution of the National Assembly, brought about the granting of the complete rights of citizenship to the Jews in France, and it is said that at that time they numbered some sixty thousand.

Remembering the Assembly of Jewish Notables of France summoned by Napoleon, followed by the famous Sanhedrin of 1807, we find the Jews proclaiming themselves as patriots and lovers of France as their Fatherland. Napoleon in 1808, as the result of the efforts of the Sanhedrin, established the system of Consistories for the regulation of the Jewish community which remained in effect until the Separation Law of 1905. Holland soon followed, and the rest of civilized Europe, as the years passed, was destined likewise to follow the splendid example of France. But the Sanhedrin was not content to rest its labors with the declaration of the patriotism of the Jews in France, but saw fit to go further, and while not expressly sanctioning, did express toleration of intermarriage. When the

Napoleonic wars had ended, we find this attitude of the Sanhedrin reflected in the circumstance that the impoverished aristocracy of France replenished its coffers and redeemed its estates with Jewish dowries. The gates were thrown wide open and the Jews eagerly availed themselves of the rights and privileges granted to them. Mixing with their fellow countrymen of other faiths, many of them, either through intermarriage or by baptism left the faith of their fathers and joined with the majority of their countrymen; others not only shook off the yoke of the Torah but abandoned all religion; even the most distinguished of them, at times, rejoiced in proclaiming themselves free-thinkers and atheists. Yet we must not be too critical, for such statistics as we have available show that there were 2400 Jews who were baptized in France during the nineteenth century while upwards of 84,000 Jews during the same period were baptized in Russia—popularly regarded as the country in which Jews have remained most steadfast to their faith.

As the Jews in France prospered greatly and forged to the front in every walk of life, that hateful viper, anti-Semitism, commenced to emerge from the mud of ignorance and bigotry, and to lift its vicious head. The triumph of anti-Semitism and the apparent downfall of the Jews in France culminated in 1886 with the famous Dreyfus affair of hateful memory. The righting of that unspeakable wrong and the expiation of that terrible crime came in the fullness of time, and caused Col. Piquart, the indefatigable champion of Dreyfus, to call attention to the fact in 1906, that two Jews, co-religionists of Dreyfus, were then occupying the position of Chef de Cabinet—one as Minister of War and the other as Minister of Marine—the two departments to which is entrusted the defence of the nation. One would think that this monster anti-Semitism would have proven a bulwark of Judaism, and yet we must confess that its effect upon the Jews in France, as Jews, seems to have been negligible.

The Jews in France have proven themselves time and time again loyal citizens of the Republic and lovers of their Fatherland. They have been in the front ranks of those who have ever striven to maintain her honor. Judged by the supreme

test of patriotism—the readiness and willingness to die if need be for one's country—the Jew in France has never been found wanting. In the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 the Jews in France rallied to the defence of their country, and in the present cataclysm which has rent the world asunder, the Jew in France from the first outbreak of hostilities, steadfastly and eagerly as a patriot and as a man has given his life, his property and all that he holds dear to the service of his Fatherland.

How much truth there may be in the cry of the anti-Semite that the Jews, having settled in France under the pretense of seeking religious liberty, are completely forsaking their religion and are substituting for the "Decalogue" the "Declaration of the Rights of Men" we leave for History to judge. We know that from the Jewish pulpit in France the same lamentation has often gone forth. But we also know that "the remnant of Israel" still has many worthy representatives in France. We know that Judaism has ever renewed her youth like the eagle and that in the fullness of time the Jew in France will demonstrate to the world that he can be and is not only a loyal French citizen but that he is also a loyal Jew. And after all, should we not cast the beam out of our own eye before we seek for the mote in our neighbor's?

THE JEW AS A CITIZEN IN GERMANY *

BY LEON HÜHNER

THE history of the Jews of Germany goes back to the days of Roman dominion when the great mass of Teutonic peoples were still barbarians. Before the introduction of Christianity they enjoyed all the privileges of Roman citizenship, but thereafter their rights were gradually abridged, citizenship was lost and the Crusades brought the additional element of hideous persecution. Thousands of volumes have not succeeded in telling adequately the story of the sufferings of this unfortunate people. The Emperors who often found Jews useful in their financial affairs, sometimes protected them from popular fury, and to do so, resorted to the fiction that all Jews had become the personal property of the Emperor Titus at the destruction of Jerusalem, a right which they claimed as his successors to the Empire. This property right they subsequently granted or sold to other princes, so that by the sixteenth century, Jews everywhere in Germany were the chattels of the particular prince in whose domain they resided.

The history of the Jew in Germany differs from that in England or France in that it is the history, not of one, but of thirty-six different states. In general, however, his condition was much the same in all. Hardly considered a human being, he was segregated in ghettos, shut out from the exercise of arts and crafts, and all secular education was denied him. Frequently expelled from one petty state, he might find a temporary asylum in another, but could never be sure how long that refuge would last. During the Middle Ages his history is not one of even limited rights, but rather a recital of added hardships and burdens.

* Address delivered December 6, 1914.

Deprived of all secular education, even his very language gradually became different from that of the rest of the population, and he developed a jargon which formed an additional barrier to all social intercourse.

Dean Milman well sums up the condition of the Jews during this period in the following words: "They cared little who ruled over them, they took no interest whatever in the great political struggles of the age, they were indifferent as to which party was in the ascendant and cared little either for Guelf or Ghibilline, Pope or Emperor."

And it was but natural that this should be so, for there could be no idea of patriotism in a people whose entire energy was of necessity concentrated upon the very preservation of life.

The only bright ray in all that awful gloom is found in the fact that the Jew had a language and literature all his own, a treasure which he could carry from place to place and which was understood and appreciated by his co-religionists in every nook and corner of the world whither he might be driven. Were it not for the Hebrew tongue and his sacred writings, the Jew would undoubtedly have degenerated under the weight of the brutality practiced upon him, and become a brute himself. But in their ghettos they cherished certain ideals. Shut out from the rest of the world, they had a community all their own within the narrow Jew Street, and to its ideals, its customs and traditions, they were intensely loyal.

Even the Reformation and the ages that followed, brought little relief, though Prussia and the Hohenzollerns treated the Jews more fairly than other German states. But even here they were expelled from Berlin in 1573, not to be re-admitted for nearly a century. They were wanderers everywhere. At best, toleration was limited to periods of twenty years, their number was kept at a certain minimum, a census was taken from time to time, and stringent laws enforced limiting the number of marriages among them. They had to carry credentials at all times, much like the Chinaman in America to-day. A favored few were granted special privileges or permission to exercise some particular trade or calling. These were known as "Schutz-Juden" and "Hof-Juden," Protected Jews and Court

Jews. Saxony and Bavaria were perhaps the most persecuting of all the German states.

Special taxes were the rule everywhere, and were frequently enforced with the utmost rigor. When the Jews of Berlin, for instance, petitioned King Frederick William I for the removal of burial dues in the case of their poor, the answer was, that if in any case such dues were not paid, the hangman should take the body on his wheelbarrow and bury it under the gallows.

Even in the age of Rousseau and Voltaire, so scholarly a monarch as Frederick the Great still harbored all the prejudices of his ancestors and unblushingly proclaimed his policy to diminish the number of Jews in his realm.

Under Frederick, Jews were still excluded from most branches of skilled labor; their number was limited, and upon marriage they were compelled to buy a considerable quantity of wretched china from the royal factory and export it. In other German states their condition was even worse. In Bavaria for nearly two centuries prior to 1714, no Jews were permitted to reside except at Fürth and Sulzbach. Even when admitted, they had to live in Ghettos, outside of which they were compelled to be conspicuous by wearing a badge. As late as 1800 Saxony and Wurtemberg forbade their residence except in the capital, while at Frankfort as late as 1807, their number was restricted to five hundred families, only twelve couples were permitted to marry annually, and they were not permitted to promenade in the main streets, nor to dine at restaurants.

Everywhere the Jew was not designated as Prussian, Bavarian or Saxon, but always as belonging to "the Jewish Nation." He was the stranger, the alien, no matter for how many centuries his ancestors had resided in a given locality, and he had no share in either civil or political affairs.

Finally, after a thousand years came the first ray of light. It came from outside of Germany, in the great world movement which proclaimed the rights of man. The principle preached by the great French writers Rousseau, Montesquieu and the rest had been put into practice in America, and the United States was the first State since imperial Rome, to grant the Jews equality and citizenship.

The principle of the brotherhood of man was shortly afterward proclaimed in thunder tones by the French Revolution, and its formula written in big burning letters for all the world to read. The Jew was included, not because prejudice had vanished, but because he fitted into a formula which permitted of no exception.

Napoleon carried that formula into Germany on his victorious standard, and in their hour of peril before the mighty conqueror, the various German princes sought to conciliate even the meanest of their subjects by lavish promises of emancipation, much like the promises which it is believed are being made by Russia to-day. One by one fell the Ghetto walls. Even Bavaria began to give them certain liberties; she opened her schools to Jews in 1804, permitted them to bear arms in 1805, and in 1808 abolished the poll tax, a law which had compelled Jews to pay a tax at every turnpike, like so much cattle. Prussia and other states did the same. Napoleon carried the principle of universal equality and citizenship into the Rhineland and Baden, and in 1807 it became the cornerstone of the constitution of the Kingdom of Westphalia, which he founded. Here for the first first time in fifteen centuries the German Jew became the full equal of his Christian fellow. He was compelled to adopt German names and for the first time learned the meaning of the magic word, "Fatherland." Little wonder, then, that in these states they idolized Napoleon and that Heinrich Heine wrote so sympathetically of his boyhood impressions of the great Emperor, in his book "Le Grand."

The greater the peril grew, the more the German states now vied with each other in restoring to the Jew his rights as man. Prussia led the way after her disastrous defeat at Jena in 1806 and practically granted citizenship in 1812. The other states followed, and even Bavaria granted partial citizenship in 1813. Famous men, like Wilhelm von Humboldt, had insisted right along that Jews be made full citizens and differ from other citizens in religious matter only. Yet amid this great national awakening, it is sad to note that sentiments hostile to Jewish emancipation came from Germans no less distinguished than Fichte and Goethe.

Fichte was uncompromising and bitter, while Goethe seems to have considered Jewish emancipation premature and impracticable. In a letter to Bettina von Arnim, written in 1808, he says: "The Jewish champion naturally views his people as they should be, and may become, but the sovereign must not be blamed for dealing with this race as it is, and as it will remain for yet a while." In another letter, written the same year, he expresses satisfaction at the temporary set-back of the progressive movement in this connection.

There was another great influence, however, that had partially paved the way, and prepared the Jew for civil and political equality. This was the intellectual emancipation of the Jew, which had commenced a few decades earlier. Long before the advent of the French Revolution, the famous philosopher Mendelssohn had realized how much the lack of command of the German language was responsible for the barriers existing between Jew and Gentile, and how great an obstacle the jargon was to the promotion of social intercourse. To overcome this obstacle, Mendelssohn translated the Hebrew Scriptures into classical German, and his translation, printed in Hebrew characters, soon became his people's manual for acquiring the vernacular. By this means the Jews of the Ghettos soon became familiar with the German of their fellows, and having mastered the language, they soon began to read secular literature as well. In a comparatively short time a circle of cultured Jews and Jewesses had emerged, who became the friends and intimates of some of the foremost leaders of German culture. The influence of this circle penetrated into the darkest Ghettos, so that the Napoleonic Wars found the relations between Jew and Gentile (particularly in the large cities) closer than it had ever been before, and the former better qualified for political emancipation than he had been half a century earlier.

The Jew responded splendidly to his new condition. He took part in all that made for his country's welfare, and often even sought to outdo his Christian comrade in his devotion. During the war for German liberation he served in the army and gave liberally to the cause. The grandfather of the late Baron de Hirsch for instance, raised and equipped a whole battalion at his

own expense. The Prussian Chancellor von Hardenberg testified to their public spirit and patriotic services in no uncertain terms. Between 1813-15 no less than seventy-two Jews received the Iron Cross for bravery in the field, and Prussia had forty-four Jewish officers in her army.

But no sooner was the danger over, than the ungrateful states forgot their promises. Even Prussia narrowed her Edict of Emancipation by ingenious interpretation, and Jewish officers were even deprived of the commissions they had won on the field of battle. Soon restrictive laws were passed, and in 1828 Jews were prohibited from using German first names, while the use of German in the synagogue service was prohibited in the year following. Bremen in 1815, and Wurtzberg in 1819 expelled their Jews. Bavaria enforced to the full, all her mediæval statutes, while Saxony and Wurtemberg again forbade the exercise of trades. The watchword everywhere was "No Christian, No German."

But the old order of things could not be restored as readily as princes imagined. The Jew everywhere had breathed the air of freedom, and though his liberty had been short lived, it had so transformed him that he would not yield without a struggle. Moreover the war had brought to the front men like the Rothschilds, who now wielded considerable influence. Far more potent than all this, however, was the fact that the German people itself had changed; the masses had become more liberal, and no longer bowed to the dictates of their princes, as they had formerly done. Social intercourse with the Jew had become more general, they understood him better, and gifted men of both faiths took up the struggle in his behalf. Nevertheless the reactionary measures gained ground year by year, until Prussia alone had twenty-one sets of territorial laws applicable to the Jews in her eight provinces and by 1830 there was not a German state except Luxemburg, where the Jew enjoyed equality.

The French Revolution of that year, however, again emphasized the Rights of Man, and in Germany appeared the great champion of that principle, in the person of Gabriel Riesser.

Riesser was a young Hamburg Jew who had taken his degree as Doctor of Law *summa cum laude*. When he found that,

owing to his creed, he was denied the right to practice his profession or even to lecture at universities, he wrote his famous memorial in 1831, and this marks the beginning of complete Jewish emancipation. It aroused all Germany, and soon liberal Christian theologians, professors and statesmen came to his assistance. A great movement had started, and soon the whole country was flooded with a vast literature pleading for Jewish emancipation. The writings of Heine and Börne were powerful agents in lashing the German people to a realization of its injustice. Jews were now elected to office, though the electors knew they would not be seated. In 1845 the Rhine Provinces, and later the Prussian Deputies, voted complete emancipation, though the King refused his assent, and declared that he would never permit Jews to hold office which might give them even the least authority over Christians.

But Riesser continued the struggle, and gained the respect and confidence of the German people, because he combined a sincere devotion to his faith with the most ardent German patriotism. In one of his impassioned addresses he stated his position in the following eloquent language:

"That *we* conceive right and freedom differently, that we are striving with all our might to attain a higher liberty in a different way from the one indicated by others, and that we are determined so to strive with the last breath of our being—this it is which makes us worthy to be Germans and to be called Germans. The sonorous tones of the German language, the songs of the German poets, have kindled and nourished the sacred fire of German freedom in our breasts. We *want* to belong to the German fatherland, we *will* belong to it in all respects. It *can* and *may* demand of us everything that it is justified in demanding of its citizens. We will sacrifice everything to it willingly—*only not* religion and faith and truth and honor; for Germany's heroes and Germany's scholars have not taught us that one becomes a German through a sacrifice of this kind."

The Revolution of 1848 shook every throne in Germany. The great National Parliament assembled at Frankfurt, and Riesser, now a Deputy, not only proposed Jewish emancipation, but popular suffrage as well. He was elected 2nd Vice-President of the Parliament by an overwhelming majority, and soon *this man*, who but a few years earlier was ineligible for even

petty office, now repeatedly presided over the great national assembly of the whole German people.

The liberal constitutions that followed, emancipated the Jews in many German states, though some narrowed those rights subsequently by interpretation. Bavaria alone remained mediæval. She now enforced so stringently her ancient laws, limiting the number of Jewish marriages, and the right to engage in trade, that an enormous emigration of Jews to the United States followed, and many of the descendants of these immigrants are among the foremost Jewish families of America to-day.

Riesser and other champions continued their agitation so successfully, however, that nearly all the German states had granted complete civil equality by 1862. Saxony followed in 1868 and the North German Confederation by its law of July 3, 1869, completed the work within its jurisdiction. Bavaria was the last state to yield.

When the Franco-Prussian War broke out, the Jews in the various German states were to all intents and purposes completely emancipated, and they fully justified the principle of civil equality, by standing shoulder to shoulder with their Christian fellows in all the vicissitudes of the various states to which they belonged. Although forming but an insignificant percentage of the population, several thousand of them served throughout the struggle, and of these 327 received the iron cross, while 84 obtained corresponding decorations in their respective states. Among Jewish physicians who served in that war, are several whose names have become famous in medical literature, such as Baginski, Lassar, Brieger, Herschwald, Rosenthal, Mink, Schilling and Wolff. The decree of the New German Empire in 1871 finally crowned the structure of German equality, and like a powerful searchlight, lit up even those remote corners of the realm where traces of special legislation still remained.

Within the past thirty years, however, a new reactionary force has appeared, in what is known as anti-Semitism. Among its foremost exponents was the famous historian Treitschke. This force has frequently asserted its power and even has its party in the Reichstag. While it has been unable to impair the

legal status of the Jews or their citizenship, its agitation has nevertheless effected the result that Jews have not been appointed to high office or to professorships except in extraordinary cases, and that Jews have not been commissioned officers in the army for that entire period. Although the government maintains that appointments are made irrespective of creed, it has been pointed out, that while no conforming Jew has been promoted, three hundred apostate Jews have been made officers.

"Equal laws protecting equal rights," said James Madison, "are found to be the best guarantees for love of country." As soon as the Jew was given even a moderate share of liberty in Germany, he became thoroughly identified with the interests and ideals of his country. He studied her literature, her art, her music, her problems, and fought her battles in the forum and in the field. How thoroughly he has accomplished this, is evident when we reflect that no history of German literature is complete without the names of Heine and Auerbach, no history of her music, without mention of Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer. Her popular political party is founded on the principles of Karl Marx, championed by Ferdinand Lasalle, while the names of Lasker and Bamberger are identified with her legislative history.

Perhaps the following quotation from Leroy Beaulieu may not be amiss to illustrate this complete nationalization.

"In Germany, the Jews of the Rhine, the Elbe and the Oder are genuine Germans In 1867 I spent a few months at Dresden in an Israelitish family. There I met a young man, eighteen years of age, of pure Jewish race, who could read Genesis at sight in Hebrew. Like Lasalle, he was an ardent champion of Germany unity, but he was also a loyal subject of Saxony. He longed for the restoration of the German empire, but he would have the King of Saxony made Emperor. 'If France dares to oppose our unification,' he said to me, 'it will cost you dear. We shall go to Paris; we shall take back Alsace and Lorraine.'"

"He did not know how truly he was speaking. Three years later he had to march into France with thousands of his co-religionists, all singing in unison with their Christian comrades,

Die Wacht am Rhein. This descendant of Jacob, with his brown hair and black eyes might have been taken as a type of the German youth. He was completely imbued with the spirit of Germany; he despised the Slav and *der Welsche*; he professed the naïve philosophy of history entertained by certain doctors across the Rhine. According to him, nothing great had ever been accomplished in the world except by the Germans; the worth of modern nations was in proportion to the dose of Teutonic blood injected into their veins. He appeared to forget that he, himself, very possibly, had not in his body a single drop of the blood of Arminius. He seemed quite taken aback when I took the liberty of telling him this. All the other Israelites whom I met in this Saxon family were equally German; I could not, as a rule, distinguish them from the Christians. One day there came to dinner a Berlin Jew who had carried the needle-gun at Sadowa. He was a thorough Prussian, blond and rosy, with a loud voice and a Berlin accent. 'Since Koenigsgrætz,' he said, 'one is proud of being a Prussian.' And in all of them, Prussian or Saxon, a foreigner recognizes the German national pride."

Despite anti-Semitism, hardly a year passes that Jews are not honored with titles and decorations for meritorious service. They appear in every walk of life and their public spirit has done much to beautify the leading cities of the empire.

In a recent work dealing with the makers of modern Germany, one-fifth of the book is devoted to the careers of Jews, and this is the more significant when we remember that they constitute but one per cent. of the entire population.

The creator of Germany's magnificent merchant marine and head of her greatest shipping line is Albert Ballin; the head of the Deutsche Bank, her greatest financial institution, is Arthur von Gwinner; the man who, more than any other, has placed Germany in the foremost rank industrially, the head of her great electric works, is Emil Rathenau; her foremost theatrical manager is Max Reinhart; her greatest living painter is Max Lieberman; her foremost journalist, Maximilian Harden, and one of her greatest scientists, Paul Ehrlich. Scores of additional names might be mentioned, all Jews, but all heart and soul German, proud of their country and its traditions.

And it is but natural that this should be so, for it is human nature, and the Jew is no exception. We are the product of our environment. The German Jew, lulled to sleep in childhood by German lullabies, taught her folk songs and fairy tales, nurtured on her traditions and educated in her schools, reading Lessing and Schiller and Goethe, naturally looks upon these folk songs and these classics as his sacred heritage. Their language is his language, the heroes of Germany are his heroes, her traditions, her thinkers and poets, are *his* pride and delight, no less than his Gentile brother's.

Ludwig Fulda, the famous German playwright, himself a Jew, voiced the sentiment about a year ago, when writing of his co-religionists he said: "Germany is their fatherland, they love it, even if at times it makes love difficult for them. They must be Germans because their heart compels them to be. They have not given up their nationality as lightly and as quickly as the Germans have been wont to do in other lands. Many songs of Heinrich Heine, who dares deny it, have become German folk songs, and a Jew gave to German village tales a new impulse and popularity." Then speaking of himself, he adds:

"Whatever I am, an author or not, it is not for me to judge, and any one has the right to deny me a claim to talent; but if any one denies that I am German, I laugh right into his face."
(*So lache ich ihn ins Gesicht.*)

This represents the attitude of the Jews of Germany to-day, or as Leroy Beaulieu put it, "The Jews of Germany are Germans with all the virtues and all the failings of that nation."

THE JEWS AS CITIZENS IN HOLLAND, ITALY AND SWITZERLAND *

BY ARTHUR K. KUHN

CITIZENSHIP as we now understand the term, is a reciprocal status. It signifies the relation out of which arises the right of the state to the obedience and loyalty of the individual, and reciprocally, the right of the individual on his part to demand the protection and justice which the state is in duty bound to afford. The new significance which the term acquired, may be traced in large measure to the French Revolution. The emancipation which that great struggle effected for all masses was eventually shared by the Jew.

It is important, however, to remember that the Jew cannot be conceived of as a citizen in this sense until comparatively recent periods. In the three countries assigned to me for discussion, neutral in the great European Armageddon, the Jew possessed rights of a more or less precarious character from early periods, but we are spared the task of going back very far into history by adopting this dual conception of citizenship.

HOLLAND

The government of the Netherlands in comparison with that of the other dominions of the Hapsburgs, was always more liberal in its treatment of the Jews. The House of Orange was notable for its fairness in this respect. It is immaterial for our present discussion to consider whether this resulted from greater breadth of spiritual vision or from a mere consideration of expediency. Jews were not accorded equal rights, but from an early period they were accorded rights which were substantial and from that moment the Jew in Holland figures as a loyal supporter of distinctively Netherland policies. When war broke out in the

* Address delivered December 6, 1914.

seventeenth century between William III and the Emperor, a number of wealthy and influential Jews rallied to the support of the Dutch king. Among these we may mention Moses Machado who rendered important services to the army in Flanders. Later Isaac Lopez Suasso lent two million guilders to William III for operations against England. In 1748, when a French army was at the frontier and the treasury was empty, the leading member of the well-known de Pinto family collected a huge sum and presented it to the State Treasury. Van Hogendorp, the Secretary of State, wrote to de Pinto saying, "you have saved the state."

Even at this period, however, Jews could not be members of the guilds or serve in the army. These disabilities disappeared a half century later under the Napoleonic régime and the Jews were notably loyal to Louis Napoleon so long as he was king of Holland. Two battalions of over eight hundred men and sixty officers, all Jews, were organized under his auspices, but when William VI was crowned in 1813, they followed the lead of their Dutch fellow-countrymen and fought in defense of the House of Orange. It is known that at least thirty-five Jewish officers and a large number of men of the rank and file were killed among the Dutch forces at Waterloo.

During the last century, the Jews have obtained equality of rights and, in return, have furnished many men of distinction for service to the state. I mention two contemporaries, Tobias Michael Carel Asser, who died in 1913, and David Josephus Jitta, whom the speaker has the pleasure of knowing personally. Asser was for many years Assistant Secretary of State. In 1893 he became a member of the Council of State, the highest body in the Dutch administration. He had the unique distinction of serving as his country's delegate, not only to each of the Hague Peace Conferences in 1899 and 1907, but also to each of the Hague Conferences on Private International Law, over the deliberations of which he had the honor of presiding, and which indeed he was largely instrumental in organizing. Perhaps more than any other single individual, he was able to advance the interests of the Netherlands in effectively organizing these two world movements, so that the services of the Netherlands to the other nations of the world in maintaining a community of interest at

the Hague, are now almost indispensable. The Hague, or rather the Royal Dutch Government, may truly be declared a clearing house of international relations, at least in times of peace. I sincerely believe that this enviable position is an important reason for the sacred respect thus far accorded to Dutch neutrality by all the belligerents during the present conflict.

Professor Jitta promises to become a worthy successor to State Councillor Asser. He has in recent years also become Councillor of State and a delegate to the Hague Conferences.

Relief work in Holland is to-day to a very large extent in the hands of persons interested in the two great industries in which the Jews play a prominent part, tobacco and diamond cutting. I am informed that one Holland merchant, a Jew, temporarily in New York City, has placed an establishment accommodating four hundred persons at the disposal of the Belgian refugees.

ITALY

Let us turn to Italy. As long as the Papal States controlled the destiny of Italy, just so long were the Jews subject to many disabilities. In a country where, as late as 1856, during the Mortara case, all the most vicious types of religious tyranny were permitted, the Jew could not be conceived of as a citizen—he may have been a subject. I believe it was the solidarity thus created against the House of Austria which made the Jews so loyal in their support of the House of Savoy, to which they looked for liberation. I do not insist upon it with historical accuracy, but when we observe the juxtaposition of dates and the enthusiasm with which the Jews of Italy flocked to the standards of Victor Emmanuel and fought with distinction in the Risorgimento campaigns of 1859 and 1866, we are led to the conclusion that the Dreyfus case of that day determined the political loyalty of the Italian Jews to the House of Savoy. The Jews in Italy had first to have an opportunity to fight for some country to which with heart and soul they could be loyal, before their citizenship could be fairly appraised.

One of the most distinguished figures of those campaigns was General Giuseppe Ottolenghi, who died only ten years ago.

He became Professor of Military History and Tactics in the Royal Military School at Modena, afterward commander of an entire division of the Italian army and, in 1902 and 1903, Minister of War and Senator of Italy. Of his continued loyalty to his race and religion there can be no doubt, for the *Vessillo Israelitico* (the Jewish periodical of Italy) said of him that "he interested himself in everything which concerned Judaism with the love of a true son." There were some other members of that family, Emilio and Leonetto, who became great philanthropists. Other figures of the Risorgimento were Isaac Pesaro Maurogonato and Leon Pincherle. The latter was vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies. The great name of Luigi Luzzati of Venice, six times Minister of Finance, is of special interest to us now, as he it was who devoted his official life to the establishment of closer relations with France. His natural inclinations as a Jew and liberal were against the Triple Alliance because it meant the greater influence of ultramontane Austria. Many think that it is Luzzati's work which is now in evidence in Italy's severance from her old allies. The story of Ernesto Nathan it is needless to recount. Many of you know him personally. I only wish to say that his recent political defeat in Rome was in no way connected with his being a Jew—its cause was a reaction against the socialists, because of the inconvenience caused by the general railway strike of last spring, for which his party was held responsible. Perhaps I may speak with more authority on this point, having been in Italy when it occurred.

In no place in the world is the Jew so closely identified with and so assimilated to his brother citizens as in Italy. In manners, dress, appearance, he is not distinguishable from his brethren of other faiths. There is practically no prejudice even in the highest circles except among the clergy, where to be quite fair, it is rather political than racial or religious.

SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Constitution contains a provision similar to our own, providing that there shall be no religious disqualification or

disability of any kind. The Constitution in its present form, however, dates only from 1874. As late as 1866 the Swiss Jew had to seek the friendly aid of France and the United States even for the right of settlement on the soil of certain cantons (as one of the previous speakers, Mr. Strook, once pointed out in a special article). Jewish "citizens" in the sense I have adopted, exist only since the date of the most recent Constitution. Conditions in Switzerland are still peculiar. Notwithstanding the extreme liberalism there prevailing, the two branches of the Christian church are so powerful politically and so active unofficially as practically to discourage the holding of high office by Jews. Jews are sometimes, but not frequently, influential in the legislature and in municipal assemblies. They enjoy full political liberty and are loyal citizens. They are proud to serve in the efficient little army, especially as they need not become professional soldiers by so doing. All the young men are now with the colors, preserving the neutrality of the frontiers. Permit me to read an extract from a memorial, a copy of which was sent me last month by a member of the Legislature, a non-Jew, but signed by many well-known Jews of German Switzerland. It breathes a patriotism, which might well find emulation in our own country. It is addressed to one of the largest German newspapers in Switzerland and protests against the one-sided attitude of the German-Swiss and French-Swiss press:

"Should this (attitude) continue, the press will bear the chief responsibility, if a large part of our population no longer thinks, feels and acts as Swiss, but as Germans or French. Then all coherence will cease, and there will be an end to the fulfillment of those ideal tasks which we in the democratic melting pot of our little country can set up after the war, to help our neighbors. If this be not the case, then *finis Helvetia*."

Worthily to meet the demands of good citizenship in a neutral country is no easy task, especially when the belligerents are immediate neighbors. I trust this brief recital has convinced you that the citizenship of the Jews of Holland, Italy and Switzerland is not unworthy of comparison with that of their brothers among the belligerents.

YIDDISH LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES *

ITS RELATION TO THE MASSES

BY LEON S. MOISSEIFF

LITERATURE, in the narrow sense of the word, has had but little effect on the masses. The multitudes of humanity are not affected by the well-proportioned productions of the few, written for a small number of educated and trained readers. The odes of Klopstock, the imagery of Browning, and the symbolism of Maeterlinck have so far established no direct relation with the great numbers of men. Taken, however, in its broad sense, literature embraces printed language. It includes the political pamphlet as well as the popular science primer; the entertaining story as well as the sensational newspaper. As such, it necessarily exerts a powerful influence on the masses.

To be more definite, let us determine who are these masses of whom we generally speak with a hidden sense of exclusiveness and superiority. Paradoxically, we may say that the masses include everybody but ourselves. The science of mechanics, which is reared on the three basic conceptions of space, time, and mass, defines mass as that which exists and persists. To the Jewish ear, this definition sounds familiar, with its theological ring. Again, "*les extrêmes se touchent*," and on the most materialistic of disciplines is reflected a mystic hue.

In a more limited sense, the mechanical definition of mass also holds true within historical life. In the history of humanity, the masses were those who existed and persisted; they who, from generation to generation, molded the character of human society and created its values. Looking back at the flight of time, we

* Address delivered before the Judeans, March 7, 1915.

discern but few individuals and retain only the impression of mass.

To obtain a physical presentation of masses, considered historically and sociologically, we must recur to the pictorial idea of mass in general. Mass means to us something bulky and large, cohesive in its character and more or less continuous; its surface shows irregularities, but few peaks can be distinguished and isolated. In short, few individualities can be observed. Not that there are no individualities, but these are so few in comparison with the whole that their distinction is practically lost. Like all matters of view, the image obtained depends on the distance of the observer from the object; our estimate of the masses depends on how near we are to them. We really know only our own circle and sphere, and the individual characteristics of our acquaintances vanish with distance and time.

We thus are led to realize that the masses consist of a multiplicity of individuals, much alike to each other and to ourselves, and who are in some degree coherent and as such subject to certain phenomena of common reaction.

Social phenomena are the product of the collective workings of the many; they are mass products. And of all social phenomena, none is more a mass product than language. The study of the psychology of peoples is largely based on the assumption that the masses, as defined in the above, create language. Humanity forever strives to express in words, more or less perfectly, its presentations, conceptions, feelings and thought. This is a continuous and ever-acting process, incessantly creating language to meet the needs of one ethnic group or another. It is the ever-compelling need that produces new social instruments and organs. The victorious sword in the Teuton myth is Notung.

Out of need and necessity also came the rise of the Yiddish language. In the struggle for its existence, the Jewish mass forged for itself its language to meet its daily wants and express its soul.

There was a time, not more than half a century ago, when the Jewish masses did not read printed Yiddish. Books and newspapers were then hardly existent. All mental activity which was not consumed by the struggle for existence went into re-

ligious channels. Everybody went to the Beth-Hamidrash and studied Torah. He who could not study listened to those who did. The spoken language was Yiddish, but it was relegated to everyday communication; intellectual needs it was not expected to meet. The women were not taught Hebrew. To make them understand the prayers and holy writings, these were rendered and largely expanded by the addition of numerous legends and fables into a Yiddish-German dialect. These Yiddish-German writings themselves partook of the holy character of their originals and became practically immutable in their expressions and forms. Yiddish came to be thus considered a language to be read by women folks.

As long as Russian-Polish Jewry, forming the great mass of European Jewry, lived in the feudal economic systems of Poland and Russia, in townlets untouched by modern industrial organization, the spoken Yiddish was sufficient. With the industrialization of the northwestern and southern regions of the Russian Empire, a number of larger cities increased in population; the inhabitants of the smaller towns became movable, and finally the great emigration wave began to swell and to carry many an old landmark with it. A rapid transformation took place in the denser layers of our people; from Windmenschen and Batlonim they became manufacturers and industrial workers. At the same time, the industrial portion of the Russian Empire began to acquire political consciousness, the interests of the people were awakened, and the printed word became of vital importance.

Conditions were created which favored the pamphlet and the newspaper. Facts and ideas appeared before the multitude of which it had never heard before and an intense desire for information and popular science was developed. The people wished to learn and to see its own thoughts expressed in a language it understood and which was of its own creation. It was then that Yiddish received its great impetus in Europe. Men who wrote in Yiddish found an ever-enlarging audience, and the better Yiddish writers began to be appreciated.

Quite different and still similar were the conditions in the United States when the larger stream of immigration set in some thirty-five years ago. To the hospitable shores of our country

came a mass which was not even coherent. Torn away from their own homes, uprooted from the social organization which it took centuries to build, the immigrants came here like drift carried away by a flood. And, like *débris*, they began to settle and find themselves. With such comparatively small aid as could be given to them by American Jewry, they set about to adapt themselves to the requirements of the new home and the necessities of their existence. With the inexhaustible energy of our people, and its hopefulness, the new arrivals quickly began to orient themselves and to engage in the great mechanism of American industrialism—again proving thereby to an astounded world that a race which has survived under the most varied and unfavorable conditions must have developed within itself during its struggle for existence most valuable resisting and adapting qualities in the domains of the physical, mental and ethical. The immigrants began soon to tie together the torn ends of such social fabric as was transplanted here. Numerous societies and *Landsmannschaften* sprang up, based mainly on community of regional descent. Towns and hamlets soon had their religious and benevolent associations for prayer, for burial, for aid, and for amusement. By far the greater number of Jewish immigrants became here industrial workers, and for their organization and protection labor unions were formed. Thus the vigorous social instinct of our people created these mutual aid agencies to replace those lost in their old homes and to meet the emergencies of the new conditions.

All these activities were immediate, and had to make use of such a common vehicle of understanding as was available. The Yiddish language had to be expanded for new demands, and it received in the early days some rough treatment and produced some baroque results—but it was a working agency.

Those unseen threads that tie the individual to his ethnic group, and, in moments of danger to the latter, cause it to set aside personal motives and to sacrifice itself for the greater want, must have transmitted the signal of distress of a people in need of its own. Many young men who had received a higher education in Russia and, in time, had torn themselves away from their own people—had adopted Russian culture and intensely interested

themselves in the fate of the Russian peasantry, and not at all in that of their Jewish brethren—responded to the call and came back to their own. The better men of this “intelligencia,” who found themselves in America, wished ardently to come into close contact with the Jewish masses. Without any national ideas whatever, simply to assist their brethren, they devoted themselves to social work in the way they thought best. To get into close touch with the immigrants, the intellectuals learned to speak and write Yiddish and made use of it in their work. From semi-Russian and -German lectures and newspaper articles, a medium was gradually developed. The earlier education of these speakers and writers was helpful in producing improved literary forms and in encouraging artistic production in Yiddish. Thus were created a press, a literature, and a theatre which all deeply influenced the Jewish mass.

The press was, for a number of years, a means of propaganda of one kind or another and always in dire distress. Editors had to supplement their incomes by giving lessons to barely sustain themselves—even the meagre salaries remained unpaid frequently. Literary contributors were rarely paid at all. Gradually, this all changed; first the press and then even social work began to pay. Publishing of newspapers and books became a remunerative business, and sensationalism began to replace idealism. To-day, in New York City alone, more than 400,000 copies of dailies are printed and numerous weeklies of all kinds are published for American Jews, ninety per cent. of whom speak Yiddish.

Such was the evolution of Yiddish in the United States. Yiddish literature, it can be seen, is not a hot-house production. It is not a revival artificially created by a few enthusiasts. It is the language of many millions of people who daily do their thinking in its expressions. And as they use it in their daily life, so they create and evolve it.

But while the Jewish immigrant utilizes his own language, he need not be told to learn English. As fast and as well as grown up people possibly can, the Jew acquires the language of his new home. His inborn sense tells him at once the immense importance of learning English. This he does by might and main. He fills the public evening schools and numerous private institutions to

overflowing. True, the older factory-worker and peddler will not master the intricacies of English speech, but he will make himself understood as well as men of his class do the world over. His children will without exception be brought up in American public schools and very many in high schools. The Jewish immigrant considers nothing to be too great a sacrifice to give his children an education. Education, mental ability, and knowledge have forever been considered the ideal achievements by the Jewish people. Only in acquiring the new, the Jew does not wish to lose the old.

Before all things, a group as well as an individual wishes to live materially and spiritually. There is a need in many to see their feelings expressed in poetry, their life depicted in fiction, their thoughts discussed in essays. But Tennyson and Longfellow, with all their grace, cannot appeal to a race as old as ours and whose poetry is four thousand years in its making; nor can Galsworthy and Mark Twain illustrate our life in its tragic and comic aspects.

If we admit that in its language is expressed the soul of a people, that it can be best analyzed and understood through its literature, it necessarily follows that the individual will best understand the language of his own group and that he will express himself best in his own language. The racial characteristics of a people are found to be expressed in its language, because language is a product of the entire people, and subconsciously and consciously reflects its thoughts. Modes of thinking, ethical and esthetic values, are functions of race. The German, the Russian, and the Englishman look differently at the same thing. Heinrich Heine, the greatest lyric poet in German, could never be fully assimilated by the German people, and similarly Henri Bergson's philosophy shows marked traits of "pilpul."

It is of the greatest value to humanity and its progress that the various and differentiated conceptions acquired by races and ethnic groups through ages should be preserved as valuable ingredients of human thought and understanding. Progressive evolution is not in uniformity, not in annihilation of hereditary characteristics, but in differentiation and betterment of the individual and the social institutions serving him.

It is to be regarded as a hopeful sign of the resourcefulness of the Jewish people that in time of stress it was able to produce what it needed. Only live and strong organisms can show such vitality. The growth of Yiddish may from this point of view, well be regarded as part of the creative evolution of the Jewish people.

A QUARTER CENTURY OF THE JEWISH IMMIGRANT IN AMERICA *

BY DR. HENRY MOSKOWITZ

IT has become a commonplace, in thinking about the immigrant, to say that the problems incident to immigration are those of adjustment in the period of transition. The past twenty-five years of the immigrant Jew in America has been a period of such adjustment. What has happened to our peculiar people, with their racial tradition, their economic capacity, and their spiritual inheritance in the new country? How has it reacted upon them? How have they reacted upon one another, and what distinctive contributions did they make? What influence did they bring to the new environment, and how did the new environment affect them? It must be borne in mind that the immigrant Jew has brought with him to the new country cultural forces. The Jew has been no *tabula rasa* upon which the influences of America have been sensitively recorded. If any immigrant has aggressively implanted his individuality upon his new environment, it is the Jew. In the city of New York, for example, there is no foreign colony which has so many spontaneous cultural currents at work as the East Side and the other neighborhoods where the Jews dwell. Therefore, no estimate of the Americanizing process during the past twenty-five years would be adequate unless some stock were taken of these forces.

The first large Jewish immigration began in the eighties. This was stimulated by persecution. At that time, two very distinct influences were at work. The first and most aggressive represented the Russian dreamers, who, having been denied the opportunities of higher education and of contact with Russian cultural life, went back, like Martin Luther, to their people to popularize modern social and scientific thought and became the cultural

* Address before the Judæans, May 2, 1915.

leaders of the masses. It was distinctly a social idealism which took its nourishment from the scientific evolutionary school of Darwin and, especially, from the revolutionary socialism of Marx and La Salle.

These leaders established the first trade unions and the first socialist locals on the East Side. They laid the foundation for a popular Jewish press, in which real "Mama Lushon," the vernacular jargon, was used. They lectured before the people, and did that heroic pioneer work, the fruits of which are now felt in the American socialist movement, in the virile Jewish trade union movement of to-day, and in the very remarkable development of the Jewish press. Here I must not omit to mention the newspaper established by a member of the Sarasohn family, which was conservative in tone and which represented the more orthodox elements among the Jewish immigrants. However, the earliest Jewish newspaper was still dominated by a very strong German influence in its language. The popularization of the Jewish vernacular is due to the efforts of such men as Abraham Cahan, Louis Miller and others in the radical movement.

Profound and far-reaching was the influence of these elements, especially in the direction of developing a militant proletariat fighting for the improvement of their working conditions! The idealism of these men was one of protest against social injustice. They had an emotional contact with the workers in oppression. They sowed the seeds of that forward-looking mind in the average Jewish immigrant which contributed later to the progressive social and political movements developing in city, state and nation.

While the idealistic Russian radical was more tonangebend in changing the thought of the Russian Jew, the second influence at work among the large masses of the older Jewish immigrants kept them still looking to the synagogue and the institutions centering about it for their spiritual sustenance. The Jewish synagogue in America lacked the vitality and the potency of the synagogue in Europe, because it did not occupy a central position in the life of the immigrant here as in Europe. Many of the synagogues in this country are *chevras*, which are mutual benefit societies and insurance organizations for "*landsleute*." The

spiritual aim of the synagogue was in many cases subordinated to its social insurance and philanthropic functions. The influence of the synagogue upon the young was weak because the American assimilating forces found in them a more responsive soil. Besides, the economic conditions in the new country naturally broke down the Sabbath among the young, and the gulf between the generations was further widened by such influences as the public school, the English language, and an exaggerated individualism developed through a false conception of American independence.

The older immigrants were naturally less adaptable to conditions in the new environment, and their methods of religious instruction were, until recently, so old-fashioned as to meet with very little response from the children. The faith of the fathers in Judaism was so profound that they were obsessed by a fatalistic confidence that the young would come back to the synagogue without any aggressive efforts on their part to apply modern methods of moral and religious instruction based upon the new conditions which confronted them. The synagogue, the organizations of lodges and mutual benefit societies, represent the conservative influences in the life of the Jewish immigrant. They have played a great part in developing the philanthropic activities of the Jewish immigrants, who were generally suspicious of the German Jewish philanthropists. Cooperative tendencies between both elements of Jewry are observable—a hopeful manifestation of newer influences to which I shall later refer.

In considering the indigenous cultural forces of the Jewish immigrant, we have referred to the Jewish newspaper. The six important daily papers, and the numerous weeklies and monthlies, represent a journalistic activity which is greater than any other foreign colony. It is interesting to note the modification of the Jewish press by the American newspaper. There are two very definite influences in the Jewish press. The handling of the news has been palpably Americanized. The yellow headlines, the human interest treatment of daily events, reflect the influence of the American press. The *feuilleton*, the poetry, the sketches, the cosmopolitan interest in the Jew and in cultural forces affecting him are clearly European and Jewish. In my opinion, the best in the Jewish press is Jewish, and the worst is what the press

has taken from the American yellow journal. This is a characteristic danger of the immigrant in transition—the ease with which the worst influences of American life are assimilated. Whether these news features have answered a demand of the reader or not, we cannot say. How much of this demand has been stimulated by the supply, we are unable to estimate, but it seems to me that in the field of journalism the idealistic elements are Jewish.

The same influences can be observed in the drama. The Jewish drama is a very young institution, but already it shows evidences of decadence. The best period of the Jewish drama in America is associated with the late Jacob Gordin. He was one of those Russian dreamers who used the theatre as a medium of propaganda for what he regarded as modern enlightenment. He resisted the corroding influences of Broadway commercialism upon the Jewish theatre. After his death, the Jewish theatre became Broadwayized and the white light district sent down its shallow plays in transition. Here again we note that the best in the American drama, what little there is of it, has not influenced the Jewish stage, while the healthy Jewish kernel in their own drama has been permitted to rot.

I have referred to the numerous cultural organizations associated with the social movement of the East Side. I must also emphasize the strong labor movement developed through the leadership of the Russian pioneers of the eighties. Many of the improvements in the conditions of the Jewish workingman are due to the aggressive labor movement. This movement illustrates the strength and the weakness of our Russian Jewish brethren. They are remarkable strikers against exploitation, but, until recently, their unions were not able to live very long in times of peace. They are often too individualistic to continue a sustained interest in an organization. They present a splendid front under stress, but if they had a little of the German corps geist, their unions would be the strongest in the country. But if our Russian immigrants are volatile and enthusiastic, and fired with a capacity for sacrifice under stress, these very qualities have contributed a social elan, a dynamic force, to the Jewish labor movement which is lacking in many of the conservative American unions.

The Russian Jew, though apparently moved by revolutionary principles, has always been practical enough to take whatever he can get in the struggle for a decent living. The amelioration of sweatshop conditions is due largely, in my judgment, to the spirit of independence and the fighting qualities of the Jewish proletariat. These fighting qualities illustrate the innate dignity of the Jewish proletariat, engendered by the influences of modern social democratic thought. Theirs is no fatalism, but an aggressive will to achieve the ends of justice. In this field, the Jew has given more than he received. He has contributed to the modern social movement. Some of the best American Socialists and social reformers have been inspired by contact with these Jewish leaders, and while there has been some steadying influence exercised by American labor leaders, it has not affected the militant idealism of the Jewish labor movement.

No sketch of the progress of the immigrant Jew in the past twenty-five years would be complete without alluding to the success which the immigrant Jew has made in business and in the professions. The great growth, almost amounting to control, in the needle-working industries, doing a business of hundreds of millions in this city alone, is due to the energy and business capacity of the Jewish immigrant, who rose from the bottom, and the experiments which the employers and workers in these industries are making in collective bargaining is reflecting credit upon the Jew in industry. Statesmen and social workers are watching the development of the Protocol and other movements in the Jewish industries to-day with deep interest. They look to the results of these experiments as a guide in working out the great problem of industrial democracy. It is significant that the Potash and Perlmutter are taking the lead in recognizing the need of some enlightened method of running industry with due recognition of the rights of the workers. The number of Jewish professional men, school teachers, and civil service employees who have, through their energy and ambition, risen to important and high places, is a splendid commentary on the possibilities of the Jewish immigrant when given an opportunity in a free country.

I have sketched very meagrely the inherent cultural forces

which the Jew brought with him to America. What influences has he met in the new world? First, of course, must be mentioned the public school. In fact, the older immigrant has come in contact with the ugly forces of American city life more frequently than with the finer sides of our democracy. He has looked upon the public school as his child's opportunity for privileges which were denied him and for which he is willing to make the utmost sacrifices. The public school, in addition to providing stimulus and opportunity for education, has very decidedly given to the younger generation an ideal of physical health through athletics and sports, which will have a wholesome effect upon the next generation. The number of young Jews who have excelled in athletics has been considerable, and while some of them have been degraded by the vicious influences in sporting life, the large mass have been benefited. Wholesome physical strength is no mean ally to dignity, innate in the Jew to resent insult and oppression. Here reference must also be made to the influence of American idealism through the social settlement and the social reformers who were attracted to the immigrant population in a spirit of fellowship to help solve the social problems of congested neighborhoods.

The Educational Alliance has been one such institution which offered an outlet for the philanthropic impulse of the German Jews to aid their Russian brethren. The innate democracy of the Russian Jew has frequently resented the aristocratic attitude sometimes reflected in these philanthropists, and for years the efforts of the German Jewish brethren to come in contact with the Russian Jewish immigrant have been blocked by this conflict of attitudes. The influences of American idealism have served to temper somewhat the protests of the revolutionists, by emphasizing the American attitude toward progress. The American believes in step by step improvement. He stresses constructive reform. He is out of sympathy with a revolutionary program. He is politically and socially an opportunist. The Educational Alliance and the social settlements have shared in this theory of progress and, in their Americanization of the immigrant, they have honestly preached this doctrine of opportunism.

We cannot underestimate the influence of such men and

women as Charles B. Stover, James K. Paulding, Edward King, Jane Addams, Lillian D. Wald, Elizabeth Williams, and other reformers in bringing about, through the socialization of government, many constructive changes which have raised the standard of living conditions of the people. And in referring to these social workers, let us not pass unnoticed the name of David Blaustein, whose service in interpreting the Russian to the German Jew was one of the leading influences toward a better understanding of the common problems of both. He rendered signal service to the immigrant and to the native American by his statesman-like demonstration of the best in the Jew.

The civic standard of the best Americans has been one of the fine forces in the life of the Russian immigrant during the past twenty-five years, and while the sources of the social idealism of the early Russians and the Americans could not meet, the influence of one upon the other has been strong. It can best be illustrated by noting the growing influence of the Jew in the political movements of the day. I have stated that the *tonangebend* elements in the immigrant Jews have been the socialist and radical forces. This is not difficult to understand, for when people are the victims of oppression, they are naturally attracted by a propaganda of protest when it is presented to them; but, while many of the immigrants are in sympathy with radicalism, the Jewish voters largely cast their votes with American political parties.

It must be remembered that it takes at least from five to ten years to make a discriminating American citizen out of one unused to grappling with political problems, for distinctly political problems are new to the large mass of the immigrant voters. Besides, the immigrant starts as an economic outcast. He is interested in making a living for his family. When he violates an ordinance, he looks to the political leader for a favor, and he naturally joins the political party identified with that leader, but with his economic independence grows also his political independence, and while he may vote a machine ticket when he lives on the East Side, when he is able to pay rent in the Bronx or a Harlem flat, he begins to exercise his talent for fine distinctions and discriminating judgments on political issues. His natural

ambition for place and power makes him adaptable in the use of political organizations for the attainment of his individualistic ends without sacrifice of his independence of thought and opinion.

We must not forget that the progressive seed has been sown by the idealists of protest, that this influence is modified by the characteristic opportunist political philosophy of American life, and that the Jew, after he has made his place in the new community, responds to idealistic movements for political independence. Not a few of the Russian Jews are now leaders in such movements, and the best of the American political leaders will state quite frankly that the Jewish immigrant responds more sensitively perhaps to the independent and progressive movements in politics to-day than almost any of the other foreign-born voters.

I have apparently painted a rosy picture of the immigrant Jew. Why, you may ask, do you fail to make reference to the vice and crime among our people; to the gunmen and prostitutes? This is a dark side of the picture, at which we must not blink. Without attempting a very detailed analysis of the reason for the existence of so much vice and crime among our people, even though proportionately to the population it may not be as great as among other people, a mathematical justification of vice and crime will not minimize its menace. It has always been our boast that we have been a moral people, with a genius for ethics and religion.

There is no doubt that the older generation failed to give to the first generation of immigrants a spiritual anchorage, that they failed to transmit their fine ethical traditions, which have served to make them survive amidst persecution and oppression. Perhaps the confusion of liberty with license among not a few of our second generation Jews has had something to do with it. Perhaps the influence of an ugly environment, the weakening of home ties and of institutional religious forces, have also contributed to the lack of a spiritual foothold for the young. Perhaps this very individualism and the bad environment of overcrowding and congestion creating a social anarchy has had something to do with it, but whatever the reason, the facts are

there. They are the dark shadows in the life of a people in transition, and the central function of ethical and religious statesmanship among us to-day is to span the chasm of the generations. To interpret the finest of our Jewish traditions to the young, translated to meet their modern needs, will be to give them the spiritual anchorage which can only come when our people are attached to their roots. Unfortunately, until very recently, no attempt was made by the older generation to adapt their methods of religious and moral instruction to the needs of the day.

The efforts of the Jewish community to introduce pedagogic methods which will meet these needs are to be commended, but what we need even more is a point of contact between the two generations which both can understand. Such a point of contact is developing spontaneously in our masses through the new Jewish idealism stimulated by the pogroms. The pogroms have brought understanding between the extreme radical and the extreme conservative. Whether it is the instinct of race preservation or the consciousness of the radical responsibility for our people, or the recognition that the social progress of mankind is not inconsistent with the development of national genius, or whatever theory may underlie it, there is no doubt that this realizing consciousness of kind will bring unity to the generations—and the next twenty-five years in the life of the immigrant will result in a wholesome cementing of Jewish forces.

Already a better understanding between the various elements in the Jewish community is developing. The enlightened German Jewish leaders are beginning to recognize the inadequacy of undemocratic methods in the solution of communal problems. A Prussian bureaucracy of experts, out of touch with the masses and their needs, will not be tolerated by the Russian Jewish immigrant. The Jew from southeastern Europe is growing in economic and social power and is demanding his rightful share of leadership. Enlightened leaders among the German Jews are recognizing this necessity, and with the growth of democratic leadership among both elements, a better understanding and a Jewish solidarity will develop among them, which will aid in the solution of the Jewish problem in America.

Communal responsibility, democratic methods, and leadership

in which the organizing talent of the German Jew will blend with the democratic gifts of the Russian, will bear rich fruits in the next twenty-five years of the Jew in America. We need hold to the ideal of "unity and communal responsibility for the conservation of the best in the Jew, to the glory of his adopted country."

THE NOVEL JEW *

BY PROFESSOR JACOB H. HOLLANDER

IN the life of a learned society twenty-five years is a not insignificant period. It should serve to define the purpose for which the body was instituted and to fix the end to which its scope aspires. It should exhibit a scientific product—a definite addition to the stock of human knowledge—resultant from its activities or imputable to its stimulus. It should fortify the company out of whose union it sprang, heighten their enthusiasm, even add to their number.

Estimated by these standards, this first quarter-century of our society's existence has been, if not heroic, at least respectable. The phrase, "American Jewish history," has acquired a real, and, I hope, a valid meaning. There have been positive contributions that have dignified communal consciousness and corrected historical misconceptions in "the long conspiracy against the knowledge of truth." The bare handful of burrowers and delvers into American Jewish beginnings who met once a year in the safe seclusion of a hotel parlor, read solemn papers, and then faded swiftly into the gloom, have grown into a substantial body with curator, archives and local habitation.

Yet despite this exhilarating exhibit, the spirit in which the celebrant will approach such an anniversary is the restraint which Professor Creighton has lately phrased in relation to the last quarter-century of American philosophical study: "a retrospect of the past, although it may bring encouragement and confidence, is not intended as an occasion for self-glorification."

Indeed there is no sufficient warrant to magnify our office nor to glorify our achievement. We have conceived no history;

* A paper read at the Judean reception to the American Jewish Historical Society, April 29, 1917, on the occasion of the latter's 25th anniversary.

we have begotten no historian. This irrespective even of the fact that the doctors disagree as to the scope and purpose of our science. If the criterion be Cicero's dictum that from the voice of the orator alone does history receive her credentials to immortality—we find insufficient refuge behind the dignity, yes, sonority even, but, alas! not eloquence, of recurrent presidential addresses.

If the canon be the genial apologetic of Robert Nash's biographer that "history owes its excellence more to the writer's manner than to the materials of which it is composed"—let the gentle reader be referred to the twenty odd tomes that summate our work—and then let us fly from the wrath to come.

But we have toiled diligently and we have dragged the ponds laboriously. Archives have been ransacked, when calendared. Historical collections have been explored—through indices. Correspondences have been sifted, memoirs scrutinized, biographies examined. No Jewish—no near-Jewish—name has been permitted to escape. The facts of settlement have been as fine gold. Political and diplomatic contacts have been unearthed with ferret-like keenness. Congregational origins, institutional beginnings, personal experiences—these have been the grist of our mill.

The result has perhaps been brick-making rather than architecture. Our readers may complain that they never are—but always to be blest. Jam yesterday, jam to-morrow; but never jam to-day. We may even be charged with deferring to the example of Gray, the Regius Professor of History of the mid-eighteenth century, "who spent four years gathering material for an inaugural and died without delivering or even writing it."

But, after all, the strongest battalions are on our side. A distinguished historical student has maintained that "we are still at the beginning of the documentary age, which will tend to make history independent of historians, to develop learning at the expense of writing." In this spirit it is no mean thing to have as our creed, even though inarticulate, Lord Acton's dictum that "there is wisdom and depth in the philosophy which always considers the origin and the germ," and to employ as our rule of conduct the same great master's epigram that "every student ought to know that mastery is acquired by resolved limitation."

I am not so sure that we have not made historic mountains out of our moderate mole-hills. Our forebears here in the Western world were after all modest persons, and hardly entitled to the aureole with which deliberately or tacitly we have inclined to invest them. Here, too, the pitfall is familiar. Doyle, the historian of American colonial settlement, comments upon the New England chroniclers that in reading their writings "we are reading not a history but a hagiology," and Charles Francis Adams, it will be remembered, speaks of a filio-pietistic and patriotic stage of development in historical writing in which "ancestor worship" is the rule, and a blind sense of self-devotion extenuates sophistry and special pleading.

If a scion of the Brahmin caste can rise to the point of renunciation in which he will declare, "I would see Massachusetts men and events exactly as I see Spanish or French or English men and events; applying to them the same rules of criticism and the same leniency or severity of judgment," it is not much to hope that the early figures in American Jewish chronicling will be presented in the garb in which they were actually clad, however humble, even sordid.

But a birthday celebration is after all not the occasion to carp. Positive suggestion, not dyspeptic grumbling, must be the order of the day. If we have been prone to indulge in historical minutiae or in biographical superlatives—these are the indiscretions of our scientific youth. For, after all, we have done our first task with reasonable completeness. Facts of settlement, institutional origins, notable activities of a by-gone day, will, of course, continue to come to light. The diligent cultivator of an arable field is never quite able to remove all the stones. Each turn of the harrow, each yield of the crop brings to the surface new boulders, sometimes isolated, sometimes clustered. As long as historical interest will lead to the increasing publication of archives and records; as long as our investigators toil with the diligence of the beaver and the acumen of the ferret, we may hope to be enriched by the disclosure of new and interesting details.

Without foregoing entirely the activities which have brought luster to our society, and for the further pursuit of which our

company is preeminently fit, it seems proper that we should signalize the second stage of our life by the assumption of a new and wider activity. I have in mind the analysis and study of contemporary aspects of American Jewish life rather than exclusive regard to our beginnings. Professor Seeley explained the neglect of modern historical study in favor of ancient and mediæval, by the fact that "in that peaceful world of the past you escape all that is most uncomfortable in the present." But he reminded us that "we escape from it only by an illusion; and in truth he who desires pleasing and fascinating pictures for his imagination should have recourse to poetry—and not to history." There is no disrespect involved in this citation. It was a high philistinism that met the small boy's report that he was studying the history of Rome and Greece with the comment, "Why not let by-gones be by-gones?" My proposal is rather that the principle of our inquiries should be "to supply help to students, not material to historians"; and that the source of our inspiration should be "not Clio so much as Rhadamanthus, the avenger of innocent blood."

The direct occasion for this suggestion, let me in all frankness confess, is a manner of personal equation. For some time past I have found refuge from a pedagogue's routine in the fascination of "collecting." My quarry has been neither coins, nor stamps, not old furniture, nor first editions—but Jews—the Jews of current fiction. Not the Jews of English literature—of Shakespeare, of Marlowe, of Scott, of Dickens, of George Eliot, for that work has been done admirably first by my kinsman, the Rev. Dr. David Philipson, and then by a succession of other writers, who have at the same time widened the scope to include a minor host from Maria Edgeworth to George Du Maurier. Nor do I mean the essentially Jewish novels of our day—with Israel Zangwill and Sydney Nyburg at one end and Fanny Hurst and Montague Glass at the other. As every advanced collector must, I have specialized in a type and in a period, the casual, incidental Jews of current fiction, the Jews of the best sellers, of the department store book counters, of the circulating library, of the rocking-chaired hotel veranda.

My collection has attained substantial proportions—but I am

not yet through. Not until every novel published in the past twelvemonth has been read, dare I beg for a chance to lay the results before this or some other expert company under the formal caption, "The Novel Jew: A Study of Fictitious Semites."

The principle of selection has been, I trust, a not illegitimate variant of the well-established statistical method of "sampling." Just as Bowley chose every twenty-first household in his study of living conditions in Reading, and as Leuba selected the first name on every other page of "American Men of Science," to ascertain the extent of religious doubt in the intellectual world—so I have had reliance upon the static mood of the young lady who dispenses high, middle, and low in the New Fiction Library of Baltimore. Twice a week, sometimes oftener, I have journeyed thither and asked for a novel—a new novel, a good novel, a popular novel, any novel yet unread, the pages of which were unsoiled and the effects of which were somnolent. There has been no conscious avoidance, no scrutiny of illustrations, no consultation of literary supplements. What the goddess has vouchsafed, I have taken.

I am not yet prepared to present percentages. My exhibit is essentially descriptive. But political arithmetic came before statistics, and absolute data paved the way for relative exhibits. This, then, as a preliminary report of progress:

"I've known lots of Jews," says magnanimously our hero of the shoe-shop, Ruggles, in Henry C. Rowland's "Filling His Own Shoes." "I've known lots of Jews that were mighty fine men. When I was working in the store the best friend I had was a Jew named Simon. He left there to study art. I'm going to look him up as soon as I get time and see how he's making out." Nor is there demur from Roxana, of the tawny eyes, when fresh from the Haremluk she appraises her patrician suitor: "He is very nice," she answered in low voice, "and very handsome. He is a Jew, but I have heard that the Jews are very kind to their wives and give them a great many presents. Besides, he is very rich,"—a circumstance which perhaps contributes to induce a foregoing of the conventional matrimonial procedure in lieu of a somewhat scandalous elopement.

The Brothers Assisi, declares Grant Richards in "Bittersweet,"

are "a very ingenious and successful combination"—Algerian Jews, whose "success lay in their unity"—"all equally concerned in the same nefarious business"—dance-hall dives of Montmartre, "knowing the commercial value of women and collecting them." "Balzac should have written about that family. Victor had something of the air of a man of the world, became so rich that he even owned racehorses, and ultimately married the daughter of a Jewish banker; Edward, his elder brother, ran the Esqueline, had a wife and several beautiful children, looked as if he might be a prosperous rentier in a provincial town, and as he stood at the head of the dirty stairs and welcomed the girls who made his place their home, seemed indeed the incarnation of domestic respectability."

Clemence Dane, in "Regiment of Women," enlivens a drab palette by casual mention of "a vivid little Jewess, whose showy work was due to the same vanity that tied her curls with giant bows, and over-corsetted her matured figure." St. John G. Ervine, in "Changing Winds," summarizes a theatrical first-night audience: "A few men of letters, a crowd of dramatic critics, depressed, unenthusiastic men, leavened the mass of the semi-great. The rest were the children of Israel—Jews to the right of us, Jews to the left of us." . . . And that we may be left in no doubt of the author's predilection, when Gilbert hurls the charge "Anti-Semite," Henry retorts "Only in practice, Quinny, not in theory." More succinct but no less definite is Gordon Hall Gerould's "Peter Sanders, Retired"—blackleg and bibliophile—but endowed with "a critical eye that disapproved of all Jews," and an acumen that detects "one of look Hebraic" beneath the historic name of Blackstone.

Even the celestial ingenuity of the incredible Dr. Fu-Manchu, of Sax Rohmer's creating cannot dispense with this *vade mecum*: Abel Slatten, "our Semitic caller," a plausible rogue who in justice should be immured in Sing Sing. His record "about as black as well could be." His name assumed: "kicked out of the New York police service for complicity in an unsavory Chinatown case." "With unerring Semitic instinct," he seeks an opening in the glittering Rialto of Fu's plotting—only to fall a victim to his own treacherous duplicity.

It is the Jewish silk merchants of Dolf Wyllarde's "Exile: An Outpost of Empire," who are in partnership with the corrupt Chief Justice, and to whom he shows venal favoritism. So, too, Richmond Hervey—seducer and blackmailer—scorns the charge that he is "a director of Moses, Kalif & Company, the Jewish agents"—adding as a disclaimer that "as a rule, it would be quite unnecessary to state that of any decent Englishman." Finally, we have the conventional embellishment: "the old Jew was such a dear, with corkscrew curls and bleary eyes."

Sinclair Lewis's "The Job" fairly teems with Jews, all of about the same quality. There is, in the business college, the "active young Jewish New Yorker of wonderful black hair, elfin face, tilted hat and smart clothes, who did something on the side in real estate"—and again "the intense, curly-headed, boyish, brown Jew girl" classed as a distinct species side by side with "the slim, diabolic, star-eyed girl from Brooklyn in her tempting, boy-cut blouse," and the "ardent dancers and gigglers." Una, "as a provincial," dislikes "the many Jews" among her fellow students, and puts down "their fervor for any sort of learning to acquisitiveness." From out this "mass of clerkings" emerges Sam Weintraub, "a young, active, red-headed, slim-waisted Jew," who was born in Brooklyn; smoked large cigars with an air, knew how to wear his clothes, and told about playing tennis at the Prospect Athletic Club." Sometimes as "Yid Weintraub," his hair becomes greasy, his evening clothes develop black velvet collars and cuffs, and his ensemble "blatantly Jewish." And so on for many lurid pages.

The unconvincing scenario of "Greenwich Village," the land of New York "Hobohemians"—the saving phrase of Samuel Merwin's "The Trufflers"—features in its motley company Jacob Zanin, "a big man—a fine natural man—with a touch of genius." Playwright, intellectual, radical, he belies the conventional that "a Jew won't fight." His views on sex and feminism are those which "Masses" supplies monthly at fifteen cents per copy. He has "power, unhindered by the inhibitions of the Anglo-Saxon conscience, undisciplined by the Latin instinct for form, self-freed from the grim shackles of his own ancestry." His garb is the approved uniform—"a wrinkled suit, cotton shirt with rolling

collar, his old gray sweater in lieu of waistcoat." In the background is the more familiar type, "the unscrupulous, masterful Silverstone, a temperamental commercial director"—whose slogan is "Freeze out everybody—findings is keepings."

Replace the East Side by Whitechapel, Washington Square by Soho, drivelling balderdash by incipient literature, and we have Gilbert Cannan's "Mendel." The equipment is much the same: Jacob, the wife-deserter; Golda, the bovine tolerant; Kanit, the thief; Mascowitsch, the swindler; Birnbaum, "the big brother"; Sir Julius, the Mæcenas; and throughout Mendel, the wonderchild—artist, idealist, sensualist. The creed is "Jews are wonderful people. They know that what matters is the impulse of the soul. It matters so much to them that they have forgotten everything else. And those who are not Jews think of everything else and forget the impulse of the soul." Accordingly, Mendel cavorts through four hundred and forty-four pages, leaving us on the four forty-fifth with Miss Morrison and domestic rectitude reasonably vivid on the horizon. "I can't make it clear to you, but it is so"—the hero's cryptic aphorism might appropriately have been transferred from text to title page.

In David Graham Phillips' sordid welter of the underworld, "Susan Lennox," we have the conventional types and the time-honored labels—Jeffries and Jonas—the merchant procurers, and their business rivals, Ickleheimer, Schwartz & Company: Mr. Gideon, the Chicago buyer, with a worn, haggard face that suggests "a moth-eaten jaguar," but only portends a vulgar sensualist; Himber, the sweatshop proprietor; Julius Bam, his nephew, with a "nose so impossible that it elevated his countenance from commonplace ugliness to weird distinction"; Rosa Mohr, who "had tried the streets for a while and quit," because there was "nothing in it"; Joe Bishop, the cadet, "partly of Jewish blood, enough to elevate his face above the rather dull type which predominates among clerks and merchants of the Christian races," and so on! Not an honest, decent figure in the swinish crew. Even Gourdain—"the young French Jew, an architect on the way up to celebrity"—is a flabby parasite—a manner of Pinero man-milliner.

The foregoing exhibit is, I think, fairly typical. In the current novel, resort to Jewish character—or caricature—has become a deliberate literary device. Like the cigarette-smoking villain of the melodrama, or the gum-chewing vampire of the movies, we have a conventional “property” Jew. He is not the mid-Victorian hook-nosed money-lender and “fence,” but the procurer, the cadet, the sweater, the sensualist. Always parasitic, his watermark is as distinct as the flapping of hands of Samuel of Posen or the Yiddish expletives of Abie Kabibble. Our industrious novelist dips his brush in this color as contentedly as an advertising expert uses red in pushing gas ranges or holly and mistletoe in Christmas literature.

This is clearly not a case for anti-defamation effort nor for pulpit vehemence. As a literary habit, it results from design—which is unlikely—or from unacquaintance, which is comprehensible. In either event, the devil can best be fought with fire.

A series of deliberately planned, carefully executed studies of modern Jewish character and activity—historical in setting, statistical in exactness, neither yielding to the lure of laudation, nor to the artistry of the bizarre—a delineation of life and work as it is, not as it occasionally lapses to be—these would offer the sources to which current fiction would be obliged—willy-nilly—to turn for its Jewish materials.

And this I conceive to be the task at hand of the American Jewish Historical Society. It is no mean undertaking, no small boy’s job. But if we enter upon our second quarter with a definite sense of past lapses, a certain confidence in our scientific powers, and a scholar’s hunger for new worlds—here is, at once, our summons and our opportunity.

JUDÆAN MEETINGS, 1900-1917

MAY 8, 1900—Meeting, with Joseph Jacobs, Rev. Jacob Nieto of San Francisco, Rev. Dr. J. H. Hertz of South Africa, and Rev. Dr. Leon Harrison of St. Louis as guests; Dr. Leipziger, presiding; Julius J. Frank, Samuel Greenbaum, Dr. H. P. Mendes, Nathan Bijur and Cyrus Sulzberger participating in the discussion. (See Report in *American Hebrew* of May 11, 1900, and slightly abridged report of Joseph Jacobs' address in issue of June 8, 1900.)

NOVEMBER 26, 1900—"Jewish Conditions Abroad." Speakers: Prof. Gottheil, Rev. Dr. K. Kohler, Max J. Kohler, Chas. Brand, M. W. Platzek and David Blaustein; discussion participated in by Dr. Leipziger, Leo N. Levi, Isaiah Josephi and F. Montesser; I. S. Isaacs presiding. (See *American Hebrew*, November 30, 1900.)

MARCH 6, 1901—Meeting, with Nissin Behar, E. M. Lewin-Epstein and Dr. Rosedale, as guests; Dr. Leipziger presiding, and Isidor Straus and A. F. Hochstadter participating in the discussion. (See *American Hebrew*, March 8, 1901.)

MAY 21, 1901—"Jewish Encyclopedia" meeting; Dr. Leipziger, presiding. Dr. I. K. Funk, Dr. Marcus Jastrow, Dr. K. Kohler, Dr. I. Singer, Prof. R. Gottheil, Dr. Billings, Joseph Jacobs and Rossiter Johnson, speakers. (See *American Hebrew*, Vol. 69, page 4, and pamphlet "*A Historic Jewish Banquet in the City of New York.*")

DECEMBER 10, 1901—Meeting in honor of Hon. Samuel Greenbaum's election as Supreme Court Justice. Speakers: Judge Leventritt, Judge E. A. Jacob, Daniel P. Hays, Judge Lachman, Marcus M. Marks, I. S. Isaacs, Leo N. Levi, Dr. Leipziger, Judge and Mrs. Greenbaum. (*American Hebrew* report, December, 1901.)

MAY 29, 1902—Meeting in honor of Dr. Schechter. Speakers: Dr. Schechter (address reprinted in his volume "Seminary Addresses and Other Papers" entitled "Emancipation of Jewish Science"), Dr. E. G. Hirsch, Dr. K. Kohler, Dr. Leipziger, Prof. Gottheil, Dr. Adler, Dr. H. P. Mendes, Dr. S. Solis Cohen, Judge Sulzberger and Joseph Jacobs. (*American Hebrew*, June 6, 1902.)

MARCH 26, 1903—Dr. Kohler Farewell Dinner. Speakers: Dr. Schechter (see Schechter volume: "Higher Criticism—Higher Anti-Semitism"), Dr. E. G. Hirsch, H. P. Mendes, Dr. Silverman, Dr. Schulman, Dr. Kohler. Dr. Leipziger, presiding. (*American Hebrew*, Vol. 72, p. 653.)

MAY 15, 1904—Leroy-Beaulieu Meeting. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger, Dr. Harris, Judge Isaacs (see Isaacs Memorial Volume entitled, "The Old Guard"), Louis R. Ehrich, Dr. Schechter, Judge Bijur, A. Leroy-Beaulieu. (*American Hebrew*, May 20, 1904.)

APRIL 29, 1905—Meeting in celebration of the 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States. Dr. Leipziger presiding. Speakers: Dr. F. de Sola Mendes, "A Word of Thanksgiving"; Louis Marshall, "Jews as Elements in the Population—Past and Present"; Benj. Tuska, "How the Other Half Lives—Past and Present"; Prof. Morris Loeb, "The Jew as a Citizen"; Hon. N. Taylor Phillips, "Congregations and Charities"; Julius J. Frank, "The Jews as Commercial Factors"; Leon Hühner, "The Jews in Arts, Sciences and the Professions." (See *Menorah Monthly* for May, 1905, and May 5, 1905, issue of *American Hebrew*.)

JANUARY 30, 1906—"A Jewish Congress." Speakers: Dr. J. L. Magnes, Dr. M. Fishberg, M. S. Levussove, Dr. Freudenthal, D. P. Hays, Dr. I. S. Moses, Gregory Weinstein, Dr. S. Schulman, J. L. Buttenwieser, P. Wiernik. (*American Hebrew*, February 2, 1906.)

MARCH 21, 1906—Immigration Meeting. Speakers: Dr. M. Fishberg, "The Immigrant"; A. Lubarsky, "Odessa During the Recent Outbreak"; Philip Cowen, "Passing Under the Shepherd's Staff: Through Ellis Island"; E. S. Benjamin, "The Baron de Hirsch Fund"; Robert Watchhorn, "The Commissioner of Immigration." Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding. (*American Hebrew*, March 30, 1906.)

JANUARY 27, 1907—Tenth Anniversary Meeting, with Judge Platzek as guest of honor. Speakers: President's address; Judge Greenbaum's address on "The Jew in Jurisprudence"; Judge Platzek's response; Prof. Gottheil, "Summary of Events," and Edward Lauterbach on "Immigration." (*American Hebrew*, February 1, 1907.)

APRIL 13, 1907—Peace Meeting. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger, Dr. E. G. Hirsch, Dr. H. P. Mendes, Dr. S. S. Wise, Louis R. Ehrich, Hamilton Holt, and Dr. Samuel J. Barrows. (*American Hebrew*, April 19, 1907.)

FEBRUARY 16, 1908—"The Jew in Art and Architecture." Speakers: Louis R. Ehrich (presiding); Prof. Gottheil, "Attitude of Judaism Toward Art"; Arnold Brunner, "Jewish Architecture"; Miss Florence Levy, "Appreciation of Art"; Dr. D. A. Huebsch, "Jewish Sacred Literature and the Art of the Renaissance," and M. S. Levussove, "Some Contemporary Jewish Artists." (*American Hebrew*, February 21, 1908.)

MARCH 15, 1908—"The Jew in Music." Speakers: Rubin Goldmark, Dr. D. De Sola Pool, Lewis M. Isaacs, and Leon Hühner. (*American Hebrew*, March 20, 1908.)

DECEMBER 6, 1908—"The Jew and the Prevention and Relief of Disease," with Nathan Straus and Judge Lehman as guests of honor. Speakers: Louis R. Ehrich (presiding), Dr. Illoway, Dr. S. M. Meltzer and Dr. Frederick Wachenheim. (*American Hebrew*, December 11, 1908.)

JANUARY 3, 1909—"The Jew and the Eastern Question," with Prof. and Mrs. Ferrero as guests of honor. Speakers: Prof. Gottheil (presiding), Geo. S. Hellman on "The Congress of Berlin of 1878 and the Jews" (*American Hebrew*, January 15, 1909), Dr. Mary M. Patrick and Rev. Dr. John P. Peters. (*American Hebrew*, January 8, 1909.)

NOVEMBER 14, 1909—Reception to Central Conference of American Rabbis. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger, Dr. D. Philipson, Dr. H. P. Mendes, Dr. K. Kohler, Prof. Fagnani. (*American Hebrew*, November 19, 1909, for Dr. Mendes address.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1910—Louis Loeb Memorial Meeting. Speakers: John W. Alexander, William M. Chase, W. A. Coffin, Louis Marshall, Leo Mielziner, Mrs. Annie Nathan Meyer, Dr. Leipziger (presiding). (*American Hebrew*, February 18, 1910.)

JUNE 6, 1910—Meeting in honor of Claude G. Montefiore. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger (presiding), Claude G. Montefiore, Dr. M. H. Harris, Prof. M. Loeb, Dr. H. P. Mendes and Dr. Charles Singer. (*American Hebrew*, June 10, 1910.)

FEBRUARY 26, 1911—"Some Jewish Books of the Past Year." Speakers: Dr. Schechter's "Documents of Jewish Sectaries," by Rev. Dr. D. de Sola Pool; Dr. Kohler's "Systematic Jewish Theology," by Rev. Dr. S. Schulman (*Jew. Exponent*, March 25, 1910); Dr. Fishberg's "The Jew, a Study of Race and Environment," by Lewis M. Isaacs; Prof. Boas's "Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants," by Dr. M. Fishberg; Judge Lachman (presiding). (*American Hebrew*, March 3, 1911.)

APRIL 9, 1911—"Problems of Religious Education for Jewish Children." Speakers: Dr. S. Benderly, Prof. M. M. Kaplan, Rev. Dr. Rudolph Grossman, Eugene Lehman, Daniel P. Hays (presiding).

MAY 22, 1911—Business Meeting.

NOVEMBER 19, 1911—Hon. Simon Wolf's Seventy-fifth Birthday Meeting (postponed because of his illness).

NOVEMBER 28, 1911—Business Meeting.

JANUARY 9, 1912—Meeting in honor of Dr. Josef S. Bloch of Vienna. Speakers: Judge Lachman (presiding), Daniel P. Hays, Rev. Dr. I. S. Moses and Dr. Bloch. (*American Hebrew*, January 12, 1912.)

FEBRUARY 25, 1912—Sombart's "Die Juden und das Wirthschaftsleben." Speakers: Prof. Edwin R. A. Seligman, Rev. Dr. S. Schulman, Herman Bernstein and Albert M. Friedenberg. (*American Hebrew*, March 1, 1912, and April 5, 1912.)

APRIL 14, 1912—Meeting in honor of Judge Mack and Judge Mayer. Speakers: Judge Bijur; Rev. Dr. M. H. Harris, "Hebrew Jurisprudence"; Max J. Kohler, "The Jew in His Relations to the Law of the Land"; Sol M. Stroock, "The Federal Bench and Social Progress"; Judges Mack and Mayer; Judge Seligman Strauss. Julius J. Frank read a memorial of the late Louis R. Ehrich. (*American Hebrew*, April 19, and May 24, 1912.)

MAY 26, 1912—Meeting in honor of Herman Struck. Speakers: Leo Mielziner, "The Jew in Art"; Rev. Dr. J. L. Magnes, "The Natural Beauty of Palestine"; Prof. Leigh H. Hunt on "Etching"; Hermann Struck, Esq.; Dr. Leipziger (presiding). Memorials of Isidor Straus read by Leon Huhner and of Jacob W. Mack by Hon. Samson Lachman. (*American Hebrew*, May 31, 1912.)

OCTOBER 13, 1912—Meeting in honor of Israel Abrahams. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger (presiding), David W. Amram, Rev. Dr. J. Silverman, Rev. Dr. S. S. Wise, Max J. Kohler, Israel Abrahams, Mary Antin. (*American Hebrew*, October 18, 1912.)

DECEMBER 15, 1912—"Some Recent Books of Jewish Interests": Wiernik's "History of the Jews in America," by Rev. Dr. H. G. Enelow; Pollak's "Michael Heilprin and his Sons," by Louis E. Levy; Monypenny's "Life of Benjamin Disraeli," by Geo. S. Hellman, Julius J. Frank (presiding). (*American Hebrew*, December 20, 1912.)

FEBRUARY 9, 1913—Meeting in honor of the Board of Editors of the New Bible Translation. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger (presiding), Dr. Philipson, Rev. Nathan Krass, Louis Marshall, Dr. Cyrus Adler, Dr. W. Hays Ward. (*American Hebrew*, February 14, 1913.)

MAY 18, 1913—"Jewish Contributions to the Adjustment of Controversies between Employers and Employees." Speakers: Rev. Sydney E. Goldstein, "The Teachings of the Prophets as Prototypes of Modern Industrial Standards"; Mrs. Chas. H. Israels, "The Origin of the Protocol"; Julius Henry Cohen, "From Chaos to Order—en Route"; Dudley D. Sicher, "The Dawn of a Better Day"; Dr. Kohler; Dr. Lee K. Frankel (presiding). (*American Hebrew*, May 23, 1913.)

NOVEMBER 23, 1913—Meeting in honor of Rabbi Harry S. Lewis, Hon. Marcus M. Marks, on his election as President of the Borough of Manhattan, and Hon. Benjamin N. Cardozo, on his election as Judge of the Supreme Court. Speakers: Dr. Leipziger (presiding); Julius J. Frank, on three great English Jewish jurists (Judah P. Benjamin, Sir Geo. Jessel and Sir Rufus Isaacs), and the guests of honor. (*American Hebrew*, November 28, 1913.)

JANUARY 4, 1914—"Ignatz Zollschan Meeting." Speakers: Dr. Schulman on Chamberlain's Foundations of the 19th Century (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 5, N. S., p. 163, as expanded); Dr. Harris on Ruppin's "The Jews of To-Day"; Dr. Zollschan; Max J. Kohler (presiding). (*American Hebrew*, January 9, 1914.)

APRIL 2, 1914—Prof. Franz Oppenheimer and Prof. Boris Schatz as guests of honor. Speakers: Prof. Oppenheimer, "A Palestinian Jewish Colonial Experiment"; Prof. Schatz, "The Bezalel School" (Dr. Pool translating his address); Miss Henrietta Szold, "The Discovery of Primitive Wheat"; Miss Alice Seligsberg, "Jewish Women's Work in Palestine"; Dr. Leipziger (presiding). (*American Hebrew*, April 10, 1914.)

MAY 10, 1914—"Some Recent Plays of Jewish Interest." Dymov's "The Eternal Wanderer" and Shomer's and Morton's "The Yellow Ticket," by Herman Bernstein, "Potash and Perlmutter," by Mrs. Annie Nathan Meyer; "Prof. Bernhardt," by Bernard Naumberg. Dr. Leipziger (presiding), Benno Lewinson, Dr. M. Fishberg and Dr. Alfred Meyer participating in the discussion. (*American Hebrew*, May 15, and June 19, 1914.)

DECEMBER 6, 1914—"The Jew as a Citizen in the Country of His Domicile." "The United States of America," by J. L. Bittenwieser; "England," by Rev. Dr. D. de Sola Pool; "France," by S. M. Strocck; "Germany," by Leon Huhner; "Holland, Italy and Switzerland," by Arthur K. Kuhn; Geo. Kennan on "The Jews in Russia."

MARCH 7, 1915—"A Survey of Yiddish Literature in the United States." Addresses by A. S. Shomer, "Its Growth and Development"; L. S. Moisseiff, "Its Relations to the Masses"; L. Lipsky, "The Drama"; B. G. Richards, "Humor in Yiddish Literature." Judge Lachman, presiding. (*American Hebrew*, March 12, 1915.)

MAY 2, 1915—"Twenty-five Years' Work in the Americanization of the Immigrant." Speakers: E. S. Benjamin, "The Baron de Hirsch Fund"; Lee Kohns, "The Educational Alliance"; Dr. Charles S. Bernheimer, "The Hebrew Educational Society of Brooklyn"; Dr. Henry Moskowitz, "Quarter Century of the Immigrant." (*American Hebrew*, May 7, 14, 28, and June 18, 1915, and *Jewish Immigration Bulletin*, May, 1915.)

DECEMBER 12, 1915—"Jewish and Classical Contributions to our Civilization." Addresses by Leo Mielziner, "Greek Contributions"; Dr. Max Radin, "Roman Contributions"; Rev. Dr. Samuel Schulman, "Jewish Contributions." Prof. Nahum Schloucz as guest of honor. (*American Hebrew*, December 17, 1915.)

MARCH 5, 1916—"The Federation Idea in Jewish Communal Institutions." Speakers: Dr. Lee K. Frankel (presiding), Judge Mack, Hon. Nathan Jonas, Morris Waldman (pamphlet reprint), Felix M. Warburg. (*American Hebrew*, March 10, 1916.)

JANUARY 7, 1917—"The Condition of the Jews in the European War Zone." Speakers: Dr. Leipziger (presiding), Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Dr. J. L. Magnes, Isidor Hershfield and Herman Bernstein. (*American Hebrew*, January, 1917.)

MARCH 4, 1917—"What Can be Done to Promote Jewish Emancipation Abroad." Speakers: Daniel P. Hays (presiding), Prof. Ellery C. Stowell, Max J. Kohler, Morris Hillquit and Bernard G. Richards. (*American Hebrew*, March 9, 1917, and *Reform Advocate*, April 7 and 14, 1917.)

APRIL 22, 1917—Meeting in honor of the 25th Anniversary of the American Jewish Historical Society. Speakers: Dr. Henry M. Leipziger (presiding), Hon. Oscar S. Straus, Dr. Cyrus Adler, Prof. J. H. Hollander and Daniel P. Hays. (*American Hebrew*, April, 1917.)

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I.—NAME AND PURPOSE.

SEC. 1. The JUDÆANS is an association formed for the purpose of promoting and furthering the intellectual and spiritual interests of Jews.

ARTICLE II.—OF THE OFFICERS.

SEC. 1. This Society shall be managed by a Board of Directors of nine members.

SEC. 2. The original members at the adoption of this Constitution shall be known as Founders. They shall constitute the Governing Body of the Society for the first year of its existence. One-third of their number shall retire by lot in 1898; one-third in 1899, and one-third in 1900. For the first year the Founders shall elect from their number the officers hereinafter named.

SEC. 3. Three members of the Board of Directors shall be elected at each annual meeting to serve for the term of three years.

SEC. 4. The officers of the Society shall be a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary and a treasurer, who shall be elected annually from the Board of Directors by the members of the Society, and shall hold office until their successors are chosen.

SEC. 5. The Board of Directors shall have power to fill all vacancies in its own membership, or among the officers, for unexpired terms.

ARTICLE III.—OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

SEC. 1. The Board of Directors shall have general charge of the affairs, funds and property of the Society, and shall hold regular meetings at least once a month.

SEC. 2. It shall at each annual meeting of the Society submit a report as well as a balance sheet. The annual report shall contain a review of matters germane to the objects of the Society as defined in Article I.

SEC. 3. It shall have power to remit the dues of any member for such cause and for such period as in its judgment may be deemed advisable and proper.

ARTICLE IV.—OF COMMITTEES.

SEC. 1. The Board of Directors shall act as a Committee on Admissions.

SEC. 2. There shall be a House Committee of three, appointed by the President, which shall make all necessary arrangements for the meetings of the Society, for its dinners and entertainments.

The rooms occupied by the Society, either temporarily or permanently, shall be under the direct supervision of the House Committee.

SEC. 3. There shall be a Publication Committee of three, appointed by the President, which shall supervise the preparation of all printed matter which the Board of Directors shall see fit to send out.

ARTICLE V.—OF THE MEMBERS.

SEC. 1. The election of the members shall be by the unanimous vote of the Board of Directors.

SEC. 2. There shall be three classes of members—active, non-resident and honorary. Jews only shall be eligible to active and non-resident membership. No one shall be eligible to membership unless he be a man of general culture, who is engaged either in one of the recognized professions or in literature, art or science, or who is actively identified with Jewish interests, and at least three-fourths of the members of the Society shall be engaged in literature, the arts or sciences, or be members of any other recognized profession.

SEC. 3. Candidates for active or non-resident membership shall be proposed by two members of the Society, and their names sent in writing, together with those of their proposers, to the Secretary at least ten days before the date of the meeting at which they are to be acted upon. In issuing the call for the meeting of the Board of Directors, the Secretary shall enclose the names of the candidates and their proposers. Members proposing candidates for membership shall be required to accompany the proposal with a sketch of the candidate, and all applications shall be acted upon by the Board of Directors with reasonable dispatch.

SEC. 4. Persons living outside the boundaries of Greater New York, and not desiring to become active members, may be elected as non-resident members. They shall enjoy all the privileges of the Society, except the right to vote and to hold office. They shall be subject to the Constitution and By-Laws, and to all other regulations which the Society may make.

SEC. 5. The Board of Directors shall have power at all times to invite and to regulate the invitation and reception of guests of the Society.

SEC. 6. The annual dues of active members shall be five dollars, payable on the first day of May.

SEC. 7. When the dues of any member remain unpaid for three months, notice of the fact shall be mailed to him; and if such dues remain unpaid for one month after the date of his notification the Board of Directors may cause his name to be stricken from the roll of membership. The Board of Directors, however, shall have the right to reinstate such a member, stipulating whatever terms it may consider desirable.

SEC. 8. The Board of Directors may, upon written application, transfer to the class of active members any non-resident member without requiring him to pay a second entrance fee.

SEC. 9. Honorary members may be elected by the Society at its annual meeting upon the unanimous recommendation of the Board of Directors. No more than two honorary members shall be chosen in any one year.

SEC. 10. Each member may, subject to such rules as the Board of Directors may adopt from time to time, introduce friends as visitors either to the rooms occupied by the Society or to meetings (with the exception of a special business or annual meeting).

ARTICLE VI.—OF MEETINGS.

SEC. 1. The annual meeting of the Society for the election of Officers and Directors, and for the transaction of other business, shall be held during the first week of May, the new officers entering upon their duties on the first day of June.

SEC. 2. Special Meetings of the Society may be called at any time by the Board of Directors, and must be called by the President at the written request of ten active members of the Society, specifying the objects of the meeting.

SEC. 3. Twelve active members of the Society shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Society. Five shall be a quorum of the Board of Directors.

SEC. 4. The Society shall assemble for social purposes at such times as the Board of Directors shall designate.

ARTICLE VII.—OF BY-LAWS AND AMENDMENTS.

SEC. 1. The Board of Directors may adopt, alter and amend such by-laws as it may see fit for the proper conduct of the meetings and affairs of the Society, and for the due care of its property.

SEC. 2. No alterations shall be made in this Constitution unless the same shall be approved by a majority of the members of the Board of Directors, and ratified by the votes of two-thirds of the members present at the annual or a special meeting. Printed or written notices of any such proposed change shall be sent to the members in the invitation to the meeting at which action on the proposal is to be taken.

At a meeting of the Society, held January 9th, 1912, the following resolutions were adopted:

"That in addition to the stated annual meeting of the Society, the Board of Directors shall arrange for three further informal meetings for the discussion of subjects of Jewish or kindred interests or for addresses by authoritative speakers. At these meetings there shall be read the minutes of the proceedings of the Society of its last prior meeting, together with a brief report by the Board of Directors of its transactions since the making of its last report. No person shall be asked to present a paper or formal address at more than one meeting a year."

"The Board of Directors shall arrange for such other meetings, gatherings or receptions as they may deem expedient. No refreshments at the Society's expense shall be served at the informal meetings of the Society."

THE JUDÆANS

"There have been many societies formed in our community, but none exactly like this. Unions have been formed for purely social purposes, for benevolent purposes, and for the education of others. This Society has a purpose quite different. It is to bring together those who desire, as our preamble states, to promote and further the intellectual and spiritual interests of Jews."

President's Address, Founders' Night, June 1, 1897.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HENRY M. LEIPZIGER, *President.*

PHILIP COWEN.

DR. LEE K. FRANKEL.

JULIUS J. FRANK.

DANIEL P. HAYS, *Vice-President.*

SAMSON LACHMAN, *Vice-President.*

DAVID LEVENTRITT.

BERNARD NAUMBURG, *Treasurer.*

MAX J. KOHLER, *Secretary,*
52 William Street, New York.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Alexander, Jerome, 255 W. 108th St., New York City.
 Arkush, Reuben, 159 W. 77th St., New York City.
 Ash, Mark, 92 William St., New York City.
 Benjamin, Eugene S., 130 E. 25th St., New York City.
 Benjamin, Morris W., 43 W. 88th St., New York City.
 Berg, Dr. A. A., 923 Madison Ave., New York City.
 Bernheimer, Dr. Charles S., care Hebrew Educational Society, Watkins Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Bernstein, Herman, care American Hebrew, 44 E. 23d St., New York City.
 Bernstein, Dr. L. B., Hebrew Shelt. Guard. Society, Pleasantville, N. Y.
 Bijur, Hon. Nathan, 160 W. 75th St., New York City.
 Bloch, Charles, 40 E. 14th St., New York City.
 Brand, Charles, Windsor Arcade, 5th Ave. and 46th St., New York City.
 Brenner, Victor, 30 E. 20th St., New York City.
 Bressler, David M., 174 Second Ave., New York City.
 Brunner, Arnold W., 101 Park Ave., New York City.
 Bullowa, Arthur, 1 E. 94th St., New York City.
 Buttenwieser, Joseph L., 220 Broadway, New York City.
 Cardozo, Hon. Benjamin N., 16 W. 75th St., New York City.
 Cohen, Hon. William N., 22 William St., New York City.
 Cohen, Julius Henry, 111 Broadway, New York City.
 Cohn, Eugene, 32 Broadway, New York City.
 Corn, Joseph J., 135 Broadway, New York City.
 Cowen, Phillip, 520 W. 122d St., New York City.
 Davidson, Prof. I., 531 W. 123d St., New York City.
 Edelhertz, Bernard, 302 Broadway, New York City.
 Ehrich, Manfred W., 2 Rector St., New York City.
 Elkus, Hon. Abram I., 111 Broadway, New York City.
 Enelow, Rev. Dr. H. G., care Temple Emanu El, 43d St. and Fifth Ave., New York City.
 Fishberg, Dr. M., 57 E. 93d St., New York City.
 Fishlowitz, Dr. Gustave G., 1298 Madison Ave., New York City.
 Falk, Benjamin J., 580 Fifth Ave., New York City.
 Foster, Rev. Solomon, 90 Tracy Ave., Newark, N. J.
 Frisch, Ephraim, Rev. Dr., Hartley Hall, Columbia University, N. Y. City.
 Frank, Adam, 128 Broadway, New York City.
 Frank, Julius J., 52 William St., New York City.
 Freidus, A. S., care N. Y. Public Library, Fifth Ave. and 42d St., N. Y. C.
 Frankel, Dr. Lee K., 1 Madison Ave., New York City.
 Friedenbergs, Albert M., 38 Park Row, New York City.
 Friedenwald, Dr. Herbert, 1032 Clarkson St., Denver, Colo.
 Geismar, Prof. S., Hebrew Orphan Asylum, Ralph Ave. and Pacific St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Goldmark, Emil, 269 W. 90th St., New York City.
 Goldmark, Rubin, 131 W. 126th St., New York City.
 Goldsmith, Abram, 35 Nassau St., New York City.
 Goldsmith, August, 36 W. 69th St., New York City.
 Goldwasser, I. Edwin, 143 W. 111th St., New York City.
 Goldwater, Dr. S. S., care Mt. Sinai Hospital, Fifth Ave. and 100th St., New York City.

Greenbaum, Hon. Samuel, 2 E. 94th St., New York City.
Grossman, Rev. Dr. R., 1347 Lexington Ave., New York City.
Guggenheim, Daniel, 120 Broadway, New York City.
Goldman, William, 58 E. 83d St., New York City.
Halle, Louis J., 24 State St., New York City.
Harris, Rev. Dr. M. H., 254 W. 103d St., New York City.
Hays, Daniel P., 115 Broadway, New York City.
Heinsheimer, Norbert, 56 Beaver St., New York City.
Hellman, George S., 366 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Hershfield, L. N., 115 Broadway, New York City.
Herzog, Paul M., 233 Broadway, New York City.
Hirsdanaky, Simon, 503 W. 122d St., New York City.
Huebsch, Benjamin, 225 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Huhner, Dr. Max, 320 Central Park West, New York City.
Huhner, Leon, 52 William St., New York City.
Hofheimer, Henry, 35 Nassau St., New York City.
Heyman, Everett, 35 Nassau St., New York City.
Hyman, Julius, 52 E. 10th St., New York City.
Illoway, Dr. H., 1113 Madison Ave., New York City.
Isaacs, Lewis M., 52 William St., New York City.
Isaacs, Stanley, 52 William St., New York City.
Jarecky, Dr. Herman, 138 W. 86th St., New York City.
Joseph, Dr. Samuel, care Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Kohler, Edgar J., 52 William St., New York City.
Kohler, Max J., 52 William St., New York City.
Kohn, Solomon, 203 Broadway, New York City.
Kohns, Lee K., 42 Warren St., New York City.
Kohut, Rev. George A., Independence Ave. and 254th St., New York City.
Krass, Rev. Dr. Nathan, 1172 Union St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Kuhn, Arthur K., 120 Broadway, New York City.
Lindner, Walter, care Title Guarantee & Trust Co., 176 Broadway, N. Y. C.
Lachman, Hon. Samson, 35 Nassau St., New York City.
Lauer, Hon. Edgar J., 36 Central Park West, New York City.
Lauterbach, Hon. Edward, 22 William St., New York City.
Lehman, Hon. Irving, 37 W. 69th St., New York City.
Leipiziger, Dr. Henry M., 157 E. 67th St., New York City.
Leo, Dr. Simon N., 103 W. 55th St., New York City.
Leventritt, Hon. David, 111 Broadway, New York City.
Levussove, M. S., care College of the City of New York, 138th St., N. Y. C.
Levy, L. Napoleon, 128 Broadway, New York City.
Lewi, Isidor, 154 Nassau St., New York City.
Lewinson, Benno, 119 Nassau St., New York City.
Lewisohn, Adolph, 61 Broadway, New York City.
Liebmann, Walter H., 233 Broadway, New York City.
Lowenstein, Rev. Sol., care Hebrew Orphan Asylum, New York City.
Lyons, Rev. Dr. Alexander, 526 Eighth St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lande, Louis, 290 Broadway, New York City.
Lehman, Eugene, 216 W. 100th St., New York City.
Magnes, Rev. Dr. J. L., 356 Second Ave., New York City.
Marks, Hon. M. M., 4 E. 94th St., New York City.
Marshall, Louis, 120 Broadway, New York City.

Mayer, Hon. J. M., Judges' Chambers, 233 Broadway, New York City.
Mendes, Rev. Dr. H. P., 99 Central Park West, New York City.
Menken, S. Stanwood, 52 William St., New York City.
Meyer, Dr. Alfred, 785 Madison Ave., New York City.
Meyer, Jr., Eugene S., 14 Wall St., New York City.
Mielziner, Leo, 52 W. 12th St., New York City.
Miller, Nathan J., 437 West End Ave., New York City.
Morgenthau, Hon. Henry, 30 W. 72d St., New York City.
Moses, Rev. Dr. I. S., 222 E. 61st St., New York City.
Moskowitz, Henry, 216 Madison St., New York City.
Mannheimer, Rev. Leo, 308 W. 82d St., New York City.
Nathan, Edgar J., 128 Broadway, New York City.
Naumburg, Bernard, 30 Broad St., New York City.
Necarsulmer, Henry, 120 Broadway, New York City.
Ochs, Adolph, New York Times, New York City.
Oppenheimer, Samuel, 811 Dawson St., Bronx, New York City.
Ottinger, Nathan, 165 Broadway, New York City.
Oettinger, Emanuel, 223 E. 52d St., New York City.
Paskus, Benjamin G., 128 Broadway, New York City.
Phillips, Hon. N. Taylor, 114 W. 74th St., New York City.
Plaut, Joseph, 120 William St., New York City.
Plaut, Leopold, 17 E. 47th St., New York City.
Platzek, Hon. M. Warley, 15 E. 48th St., New York City.
Pool, Rev. Dr. David de Sola, 102 W. 75th St., New York City.
Popper, William C., 114-116 Worth St., New York City.
Posner, Louis S., 15 Broad St., New York City.
Proskauer, Jos. M., 111 Broadway, New York City.
Phillips, Nathaniel, 261 Broadway, New York City.
Robinson, Leonard G., 174 Second Ave., New York City.
Rosenbaum, Solomon G., 483 West End Ave., New York City.
Scheuermann, Henry L., 160 Broadway, New York City.
Schulman, Rev. Dr. S., 55 E. 92d St., New York City.
Seligman, Isaac N., 1 South William St., New York City.
Seligsberg, Alfred F., 15 William St., New York City.
Schapiro, Dr. J. S., C. C. of C. of N. Y., W. 138th St., New York City.
Sicher, Dudley F., 15 William St., New York City.
Siegel, Alexander B., 25 Broad St., New York City.
Silverman, Rev. Dr. Jos., 45 E. 75th St., New York City.
Simon, Robert E., 165 Broadway, New York City.
Sommerfield, A. W., 420 Riverside Drive, New York City.
Sondheim, Phineas, 49 Wall St., New York City.
Speyer, James, 24 Pine St., New York City.
Spiegelberg, Hon. Frederick, 36 W. 76th St., New York City.
Stern, Leopold, 68 Nassau St., New York City.
Sakolski, Dr. A. M., 422 W. 122d St., New York City.
Sicher, Dudley D., 49 W. 21st St., New York City.
Stein, Morton, 63 Wall St., New York City.
Schiff, Jacob H., 52 William St., New York City.
Straus, Hon. Nathan, 27 W. 72d St., New York City.
Straus, Hon. Oscar, 42 Warren St., New York City.
Straus, Jesse, care R. H. Macy & Co., New York City.

Straus, Percy S., care R. H. Macy & Co., New York City.
 Strauss, Samuel, New York Times, New York City.
 Stroock, Moses J., 30 Broad St., New York City.
 Stroock, S. M., 30 Broad St., New York City.
 Sulzberger, Cyrus L., 516 West End Ave., New York City.
 Steinbrink, Meier, 18 Fuller Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Solomon, Arthur, Hotel San Remo, Central Park W. and 74th St., N. Y. C.
 Stern, Rev. Dr. Nathan, 201 W. 79th St., New York City.
 Tannenbaum, Dr. Julius, 235 W. 113th St., New York City.
 Tulin, Abraham, 31 Nassau St., New York City.
 Ulmann, Albert, 111 Broadway, New York City.
 Unger, Hon. Henry W., 37 Liberty St., New York City.
 Ullman, Nathan, 49 W. 88th St., New York City.
 Vineberg, Dr. Hiram, 751 Madison Ave., New York City.
 Wachenheim, Dr. Frederick, 111 W. 85th St., New York City.
 Warburg, Felix M., 52 William St., New York City.
 Warburg, Paul, care of Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D. C.
 Weinberger, Dr. Bernard Wolf, 40 E. 41st St., New York City.
 Weingarten, Dr. Frederick, 28 W. 91st St., New York City.
 Wiley, Louis, New York Times, New York City.
 Wise, Rev. Dr. S. S., 23 W. 90th St., New York City.
 Wolbarst, Dr. A. L., 113 E. 19th St., New York City.
 Wolf, Simson, 203 Broadway, New York City.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS.

Adler, Dr. Cyrus, 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Bloomfield, Meyer, 6 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 Brandeis, Hon. Louis D., Stoneleigh Court, Washington, D. C.
 Cohen, Dr. Solomon Solis, 1525 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Cohen, Rev. Dr. Henry, 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas.
 Grossman, Rev. Dr. Louis, 2212 Park Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Hessberg, Albert, 57 State St., Albany, N. Y.
 Hirsch, Rev. Dr. Emil G., 3612 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
 Huebsch, Dr. Daniel, 10221 Lake Shore Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Hollander, Prof. J. H., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Isaacs, Dr. A. S., 447 Ellison St., Paterson, N. J.
 Kohler, Dr. K., 3016 Stanton Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Mack, Hon. Julian, care Clerk U. S. District Court, Chicago, Ill.
 Meyer, Rev. Dr. Martin A., San Francisco, Cal.
 Philipson, Rev. Dr. David, 3947 Beechwood Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Popper, Prof. William, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Rosendale, Hon. Simon W., 57 State St., Albany, N. Y.
 Strauss, Hon. Seligman J., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
 Wolf, Hon. Simon, Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
 Amram, David W., Real Estate Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rosenwald, Julius, 4901 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Levy, Louis E., 1424 North 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Gerson, Felix N., 2131 Green St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Waldman, Morris I., 211 Scollay Bldg., 40 Court St., Boston, Mass.



JE

~~FEB 17 1975~~

Call
MAR 10 1975

Call
MAR 31 1975

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U S A



UE

~~FEB 17 1975~~

~~MAR 10 1975~~

~~MAR 31 1975~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U S A



